FBIS DAILY REPORT
CONTENTS
Soviet Union
Vol III No 163 *22 August 1983*

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

DISARMAMENT/START/MBFR

- Proposed Space Arms Treaty Submitted to UN AA 1
  - Text of Gromyko's Letter AA 1
  - Text of Draft Treaty [PRAVDA 22 Aug] AA 2
- U.S. Reaction to Soviet Peace Proposals Cited AA 5
- Levin Comments on Soviet Arms Race Proposal AA 5
  - 19 August Commentary AA 5
  - 22 August Remarks AA 6
- Chervov Denies USSR Has INF 'Monopoly' [TRUD 19 Aug] AA 7
- Kornilov on Nuclear Arms Race in Europe AA 10
- Nordic Nuclear-Free Zone Proposals Discussed [IZVESTIYA 18 Aug] AA 11

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

- Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' [Andrianov, Volskiy, Nekrasov] CC 1
  - Nuclear, Space Arms Race CC 1
  - Tension Escalation CC 3
  - Monopolistic Support CC 4
  - U.S. Third World Policy CC 5
  - Soviet Relations, Afghanistan CC 6
- 'International Situation: Questions & Answers' [Pravdin, Naimushin, Kobaladze, Cobo, Khokhlov] CC 7
  - Central America 'Adventurism' CC 7
  - Events in Chad CC 9
- Moscow TV's 20 Aug 'Studio 9' Program [Zorin, Zamyatin] CC 11
  - Global Situation Aggravation CC 11
  - 'Psychological War' CC 12
  - Geneva Arms Talks CC 13
  - U.S. Internal Situation CC 14
  - U.S. Latin American 'Backyard' CC 15
  - Attention To Chad CC 17
  - Current Polish Situation CC 18
  - Iran-Iraq War CC 20
  - Nuclear Restraint Pledge CC 21

UNITED STATES & CANADA

- U.S. Actions on Berezhkov Affair Called 'Inhuman' A 1
- U.S. Media Cited on Andropov-Winpisinger Talks [PRAVDA 19 Aug] A 2
- Weinberger's Remarks at Press Conference Decried A 3

'Repentant' Repin Discusses Espionage Case A 3
U.S. Senators Confer With USSR Peace Committee [IZVESTIYA 21 Aug] A 4

CHINA

PRC Women's Volleyball Team Welcomed to USSR B 1

NORTHEAST ASIA

Japan Seen Linked to NATO Military Alliance [Volkogonov] C 1
Japanese Paper Cited on Defense Talks With U.S. C 2
Japanese White Paper Criticizes U.S. Policy C 3
Japan Document on Revising Non-Nuclear Principles C 3
U.S.-Japanese Air Force Exercises Begin C 4
DPRK Envoy to USSR Speaks at Moscow Soiree C 4

SOUTH ASIA

Afghanistan Celebrates Independence Anniversary D 1
    Soviet State, Party Greetings [PRAVDA 19 Aug] D 1
    DRA Leaders' Telegram D 1
    Karmal on Anniversary D 2
DRA Armed Forces Crush 'Counterrevolutionaries' [Khavin] D 3

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

SRV Proposes Cease-Fire With PRC During Holidays E 1
Gorbachev Speech at CPV Congress Published [PRAVDA 19 Aug] E 1
IZVESTIYA Views Current Issues Facing Thailand [Kovalenko, 6 Aug] E 1

EASTERN EUROPE

CSSR Newspaper Cited on Experience of 1968 F 1
Honecker, Jaruzelski Urge Unity, Arms Limitation [PRAVDA 19 Aug] F 3
Shevardnadze Receives Bulgarian CP Secretary [ZARYA VOSTOKA 9 Aug] F 4

WESTERN EUROPE

Intruder Arrested on UK Moscow Embassy Grounds [AFP] G 1
France Turning Toward Policy of 'Atlanticism' [Shchedrov in PRAVDA 19 Aug] G 1
French Communist on Economy, Foreign Policy G 3

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

IZVESTIYA Urges Dialogue to End Iran-Iraq War [19 Aug] H 1
USSR-Jordan Relations Viewed on Anniversary [Sobolev] H 1
IZVESTIYA on 'Arafat Message to Moscow Meeting [19 Aug] H 1
Al-Qadhdhafi Visits Tunis, Urges Arab Unity [Zlatorunskiy] H 2
Algerian Islamic Council Delegation in Moscow H 3
Egyptian Criticism of Camp David Accords Cited [Timoshkin] H 3

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

French Commander Appointed 'To Help' in Chad [Levchenko] J 1
Kalin Attends Congo Anniversary Festivities J 1
    Participates in Festivities J 1
        [IZVESTIYA 17 Aug]
    Kalin Departs for Home 17 Aug J 1
        [PRAVDA 19 Aug]
Upper Volta Coup 'To Restore True Independence' J 2

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

Upcoming Weinberger C. America Tour Previewed K 1
    'Far From Peaceful' [Sobalev] K 1
    Connection with Military Maneuvers [Baryshev] K 1
Results of Reagan Visit to Mexico Discussed K 2
        [Korionov in PRAVDA 17 Aug]
U.S. 'Planning' Military Coup in El Salvador K 3

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

POLITICAL & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENTS

CPSU Central Committee Politburo Convenes R 1
    Issues Discussed [PRAVDA 20 Aug] R 1
    New Department Chief R 2
Party Looks to Veterans, Soviet Youth R 3
        [Editorial in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 18 Aug]

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS

Jan-Jul Industrial Performance Reviewed S 1
    CSA Report [SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 17 Aug] S 1
    PRAVDA Report [12 Aug] S 3

SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS

Docking of Progress, Salyut Spacecraft Reported U 1
Nationwide Psychological Service Planned U 1

PROPOSED SPACE ARMS TREATY SUBMITTED TO UN

Text of Gromyko's Letter

LD211718 Moscow TASS in English 1710 GMT 21 Aug 83

[Text] Moscow August 21 TASS -- Following the full text of a letter from Andrey Gromyko, first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR and minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, to U.N. Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar:

"Esteemed Mr Secretary General:

"The Soviet Union suggests that the question 'On Concluding a Treaty on the Prohibition of the Use of Force in Outer Space and From Outer Space With Regard to Earth' be included in the agenda of the 38th session of the U.N. General Assembly.

"In tabling this proposal, the USSR guides itself by the desire to prevent the militarisation of outer space. A particular danger in this respect is posed by the plans to develop and deploy different systems of space weapons capable of hitting targets both in outer space and on earth."

"The Soviet Union believes it imperative to raise a dependable barrier to these plans to turn outer space into a source of mortal danger to mankind as a whole by urgently taking effective measures to prevent the projection of the arms race to where there has so far been none, namely, to outer space.

"Guiding itself by this objective, the USSR tabled at the United Nations in 1981 a proposal on the conclusion of a treaty banning the deployment of weapons of any type in outer space, a proposal approved by the General Assembly. However, work to draw up that treaty has not yet begun in practice because of well-known reasons.

"Time is not waiting, however, and the USSR is now suggesting that a step further be taken right away and agreement be reached to ban altogether the use of force both in outer space and from outer space with regard to earth. It is submitting to the session a draft of an appropriate treaty."

"An important characteristic of this draft treaty is a combination of the political and legal obligations of states to refrain from the use of force against one another in outer space and from outer space and substantive measures intended to prevent the militarisation of outer space.

"Specifically, the Soviet Union stands for banning altogether the testing and deployment in outer space of any space-based weapons intended to hit targets on earth, in the atmosphere and in outer space.

"It also stands for the radical solution of the question of anti-satellite weapons, namely, for the complete renunciation by states of the development of new anti-satellite systems and for the elimination of such systems already in their possession.

"The participants in the treaty would also undertake not to destroy or damage the space objects of other states nor disrupt their normal functioning or change their flight trajectories in any other way."

"In addition, a ban is suggested on the testing and use of manned spacecraft for military purposes, including anti-satellite aims; their use should serve entirely the solution of diverse scientific, technical and economic problems.

"The implementation of the complex of far reaching measures proposed by the Soviet Union would mean a major tangible contribution towards the achievement of a goal approved by the United Nations earlier, the use of outer space exclusively for peaceful purposes.

"I ask you, Mr Secretary General, to regard this letter as a memorandum provided for by the rules of procedure of the General Assembly and to release it jointly with the appended text of the draft treaty as an official document of the U.N. General Assembly.

"Andrey Gromyko.

First deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, minister of foreign affairs of the USSR."

Text of Draft Treaty

PM211953 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Aug 83 First Edition p 4

["Draft Treaty on Banning the Use of Force in Space and From Space With Respect to the Earth"]

[Text] The states parties to this treaty,

Guided by the principle whereby United Nations members refrain in their international relations from the threat of force or the use of force in any form incompatible with the objectives of the United Nations;

Seeking to prevent an arms race in space and thereby to reduce the danger of nuclear war threatening mankind;

Desiring to contribute to the objective whereby the exploration and use of space, including the moon and other celestial bodies, is effected exclusively for peaceful purposes;

Have agreed as follows:

Article 1

It is prohibited to resort to the use of force and the threat of its use in space, in the atmosphere, and on earth with the employment for this of space objects orbiting the Earth, stationed on celestial bodies, or deployed in space in any other manner as a means of destruction.

It is also prohibited to resort to the use of force or the threat of its use with regard to space objects orbiting the Earth, stationed on celestial bodies, or deployed in space in any other manner.

Article 2

In accordance with the provisions of Article 1 the states parties to this treaty undertake:

1. Not to test and not to deploy by putting into orbit around the Earth, deploying on celestial bodies, or in any other manner any space-based weapons intended to hit targets on the Earth, in the atmosphere, or in space.

2. Not to use space objects orbiting the Earth, stationed on celestial bodies, or deployed in space in any othermanner as a means for hitting any targets on the Earth, in the atmosphere, and in space.

3. Not to destroy, damage, or disrupt the normal functioning of other states' space objects, nor change their flight trajectories.

4. Not to test or develop new antisatellite systems and to eliminate such systems already in their possession.

5. Not to test or use for military, including antisatellite, purposes, any manned spacecraft.

Article 3

The state parties to this treaty agree not to help, encourage, or incite any states, groups of states, international organizations, and also physical and legal persons to engage in activity prohibited by this treaty.

Article 4

1. To ensure confidence in observance of the provisions of this treaty each state party uses the national technical verification facilities available to it in a way corresponding to generally recongnized principles of international law.

2. Each state party to the treaty undertakes not to interfere with [chinit pomekh] the national technical verification facilities of other states parties exercising their functions in accordance with paragraph 1 of this article.

Article 5

1. The states parties to this treaty undertake to consult and cooperate with each other in resolving any questions which may arise with regard to the objectives of the treaty or in connection with the observance of its provisions.

2. Consultations and cooperation in accordance with paragraph 1 of this article may also be effected on the basis of utilization of corresponding international procedures within the framework of the United Nations and in accordance with its Charter. These procedures can include the services of the consultative committee of the states parties to the treaty.

3. The consultative committee of the states parties to the treaty is convened by the depositary within 1 month of the receipt of a request from any state party to this treaty. Any state party may appoint a representative to the committee.

Article 6

Each state party to this treaty undertakes to adopt any internal measures which it considers necessary in accordance with its constitutional procedures to prohibit and prevent any activity contravening the provisions of this treaty which comes under its jurisdiction or control, wherever it may be.

Article 7.

Nothing in this treaty affects the rights and duties of states under the Charter.

Article 8

All disputes which may arise in connection with the operation of this treaty shall be resolved by exclusively peaceful means through the use of procedures envisaged in the UN Charter.

Article 9

This treaty is of unlimited duration.

Article 10

1. This treaty is open for signature to all states at central United Nations offices in New York. Any state which does not sign this treaty prior to its entry into force in accordance with paragraph 3 of this article may accede to it at any time.

2. This treaty is subject to ratification by signatory states. Instruments of ratification and documents of accession shall be deposited with the secretary general of the United Nations.

3. This treaty shall enter into force in relations between states which have deposited instruments of ratification after five instruments of ratification, including the instruments of the USSR and the United States, have been deposited with the secretary general of the United Nations.

4. For states whose instruments of ratification or documents of accession are deposited after the entry into force of this treaty it will enter into force on the day of the deposit of their instruments of ratification or documents of accession.

5. The secretary general of the United Nations shall promptly inform all signatory and acceding states of the date of each signing, the date of deposit of each instrument of ratification and document of accession, the date of entry into force of this treaty, and also other notices.

Article 11

This treaty, of which the Russian, English, Arabic, Spanish, Chinese, and French texts are equally authentic, shall be deposited with the secretary general of the United Nations, who shall transmit duly certified copies of the treaty to the governments of the signatory and acceding states.

U.S. REACTION TO SOVIET PEACE PROPOSALS CITED

LD192253 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2010 GMT 19 Aug 83

[From the "International Diary" program presented by Aleksandr Levchenko]

[Excerpts] The foreign mass media are commenting extensively on the main points in Comrade Andropov's conversation with the U.S. senators who have come to the Soviet Union at the invitation of the USSR parliamentary group. Special attention is drawn to the USSR's readiness to solve the question of antisatellite weapons in a radical manner, to reach agreement on the elimination of existing antisatellite systems and to outlaw the creation of new ones.

As far as the U.S. Administration itself is concerned, judging by Western news agency reports quoting official sources in Washington, the White House has described the Soviet proposals as a propaganda maneuver. Generally speaking, there is nothing surprising about this. The present Washington administration has not responded positively to a single Soviet peace proposal aimed at curbing the nuclear arms race. This is because disarmament does not fit in with its plans. Evidence of this is provided by the program for the modernization of all the U.S. nuclear forces and the intensive development of new weapons systems, including space weapons. After all, it was none other than President Reagan who made a speech in March this year, which shocked all sensible people since it dealt with something unthinkable, which used to be the prerogative of fantasy-mongers -- namely, war in space. In this connection Paul Warnke, the former head of the U.S. delegation at the strategic arms talks, declared: I have no doubt at all that within a decade war could break out in space unless we draw up a treaty preventing this.

By putting forward a new initiative, the Soviet Union is again demonstrating its goodwill and its determination to take action to prevent the extension of the arms race to space. One would like to hope that the United States will follow this example.

LEVIN COMMENTS ON SOVIET ARMS RACE PROPOSAL

19 August Commentary

LD191731 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 19 Aug 83

[Viktor Levin commentary]

[Text] Particular attention is centered on the new and important initiatives of the Soviet Union, aimed at averting the terrible and real danger of spreading the arms race into space. Quite recently this problem seemed to many people to be just an outcome of the fervent imagination of science fiction writers. However, the development of events has placed this problem on the agenda of the international life.

It is too late to argue about the urgency of this problem. There is no doubt about its urgency. Now it is necessary to point out the clear-cut way for its resolution.

It is known that U.S. President Reagan favors a sharp increase of military preparations in space. His views on this problem are included in the general strategic aim of the United States to achieve military superiority.

Our Soviet appropach also proceeds logically from the fundamental principles of the foreign policy of the USSR and is determined by the sincere and honest desire to consolidate peace and curb the arms race.

The Soviet Union is advocating the total banning of the use of force in space itself and in space in relation to earth.

In his meeting with the U.S. senators, Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov outlined the new and important proposals of the USSR in this field. First of all, the Soviet Union favors an accord [dogovorennost] on the complete ban of tests and deployment of any weapons based in space for hitting objects on earth, in the air, and in space. Second, our country is ready to resolve in a most radical way the issue regarding the antisatellite weapons, to reach an agreement on the liquidation of the already existing systems, and on banning the development of new ones. The implementation of these proposals would avert the spreading of the arms race into space and would thus play a positive role in the state of affairs on earth. Furthermore, there is no ambiguity in Soviet proposals. They place all the sides trying to reach an agreement on an equal footing.

I pay particular attention to this fact because Weinberger, the U.S. secretary of defense, made a hurried statement to the effect that the Soviet Union does, supposedly, not wish to create antisatellite systems because it already possesses them.

Well, the Soviet proposal, and I repeat here, refers not only to the banning of the development of new systems, but also to the destruction of the existing ones.

The Soviet stand's honesty and adherence to principle [printsipialnost] is also confirmed by the exceptionally important pledge of the USSR not to be the first to put into space any types of antisatellite weapons. It means that our country is introducing a unilateral moratorium on such launchings for the entire period of time when other states, including the United States, refrain from launching into space any type of antisatellite weapons.

22 August Remarks

LD220913 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0400 GMT 22 Aug 83

[Text] Today the papers publish the letter from Comrade Gromyko, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and USSR minister of foreign affairs, to Perez de Cuellar, UN secretary general, which sets out the proposal by the Soviet Union to include in the agenda for 38th UN General Assembly session the question of the concluding of a treaty on the banning of use of force in and from space. At the same time a draft of such a treaty is published. At the microphone is our commentator Viktor Levin :

[Levin] The essence of the new, important peace initiative by the Soviet Union, set out by Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov at his meeting with U.S. senators, is the aspiration to prevent the menacing and real danger of the arms race spreading to space. The issue here is to preserve it as a zone of peace. It is self-evident that the prevention of the spread of the arms race has very great significance for matters on earth. The Soviet Union's proposals infringe on no one's interests and place no one in a worse position. These proposals are based on the solely just principles of equality and mutual security of the sides. They demonstrate the good will of the Soviet Union, our sincere and honest aspiration for the consolidation of peace.

This is confirmed by the extremely important pledge unilaterally undertaken by the Soviet Union concerning the introduction of a moratorium on the launch of antisatellite weapons of any kind into space. This moratorium will be in operation the whole time while other states, including the United States, refrain from introducing antisatellite weapons of any kind into space. And this means that if the United States and other states support the Soviet initiative an extremely important step will have been made on the path toward the nonuse of force in space even before the appropriate treaty has been concluded.

CHERVOV DENIES USSR HAS INF 'MONOPOLY'

PM192000 Moscow TRUD in Russian 19 Aug 83 p 3

["Military Review" by Colonel General N. Chervov, chief of the Directorate of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces: "Who Strives for Missile Monopoly"]

[Text] The deployment of new American medium-range missiles on the territory of the FRG, Britain, Italy, and other West European countries, planned for the end of 1983, is a constituent part of the efforts of the U.S. Administration, which is trying to achieve military superiority. On the way to this end the United States resorts to all sorts of tricks, even including direct deception of the public, if only to prevent agreement at the talks on limiting nuclear arms in Europe and establish its new first-strike missile weapons there.

Among many fabricated inventions Washington has recently been persistently disseminating is the fairy tale of the USSR's "monopoly" of so-called nuclear "intermediate-range missiles." It has supposedly always had this "monopoly" and intends to preserve it in the future. On what is this fairy tale based? On nothing. It has simply been invented by American propaganda. In fact, the USSR has never had and now has no "missile monopoly." Let us look at the facts.

The United States introduced its medium-range missiles into Europe back in the mid-fifties. They were Matador, Mace, Thor, and Jupiter missiles. The Soviet Union did not have any medium-range missiles until the end of the fifties. Who, one wonders, possessed the "missile monopoly" in Europe in those years? It was the United States. And the situation did not change subsequently. In the early sixties the United States deployed in Europe a large grouping of Pershing I solid-fuel mobile missiles with a range of almost 800 km, which noticeably destabilized the situation. And a little later Britain and France acquired sea-launched missiles. At the same time NATO's missile potential in Europe increased sharply as a results of the placing of America SLBM's at the direct disposal of the NATO bloc's command.

Under those conditions the USSR was forced to create means for its own defense. And it did create them -- SS-4 and SS-5 missiles, which it deployed on its own territory in quantities counterbalancing the corresponding U.S. and NATO nuclear arms in Europe. Faced with the ever-increasing nuclear threat, the Soviet Union was then forced to embark on the modernization of its own medium-range missiles, replacing the obsolete SS-4 and SS-5 missiles with new SS-20 missiles. This substitution, however, did not alter the strategic situation in Europe: The total number of Soviet missiles had not increased but had even fallen; the sides' correlation of forces in terms of medium-range nuclear arms as a whole remained at the former level. And in the present state of affairs the Soviet SS-20 missiles are just a counterweight to the medium-range nuclear means of the United States and the NATO countries in Europe, including the nuclear missiles of Britain and France.

Western propaganda allegations that the USSR is striving for a "missile monopoly" do not stand up to criticism.

Everyone knows that the USSR is prepared to leave itself with exactly the same number of missiles in the European part of the country as Britain and France have. It has expressed readiness to reach agreement on the equality of nuclear potentials in Europe not only in terms of delivery vehicles (missiles and aircraft) but also in terms of the warheads on them. "...On this basis," Marshal of the Soviet Union D.F. Ustinov, USSR minister of defense, said, "we are prepared even tomorrow to begin equalizing the numbers of the sides' missiles." Where, then, is the "Soviet missile monopoly" here? There is none. There is only the stubborn U.S. desire to assert that the nuclear missiles of Britain and France must not be taken into consideration in the European balance of forces on NATO's side.

Why must they not, if you please? Are not Britain and France members of the North Atlantic Alliance? Because, the American side says, these countries are not participating in the Geneva talks, are opposed to reducing their nuclear means, and say that taking their arms into account will affect their sovereignty. In addition, the British and French missiles are supposedly earmarked only for the defense of those countries and not of West Europe as a whole; and their weapons, in general, are strategic and should not be taken into account at the talks on limiting medium-range nuclear means.

Perhaps such arguments by Washington could mislead some people in the West, if you look at things abstractly. But what if you take a realistic look at the British and French missiles, evaluating objectively their place and role in the European nuclear balance? In this case you get quite a different picture.

It certainly does not follow from the nonparticipation of Britain and France in the talks that these countries do not exist in Europe and that their nuclear missiles weigh nothing in the balance of forces on NATO's side. Thus, it is a question of taking account of an objective reality, which in no way depends on whether or not talks are being held. We are told virtually in the form of an ultimatum not to notice the more than 400 warheads on British and French missiles targeted on the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. Not to notice them just because the British and French nuclear weapons are said to be under national control. But the "potential enemy" is none the better for it. Some 162 missiles capable of delivering hundreds of nuclear charges to targets stand ready. This is not fiction. It is a threat that must be parried.

The USSR's proposal to take the British and French nuclear missiles into consideration in the balance on the NATO side absolutely does not touch upon the interests of British and French sovereignty. The Soviet Union has never denied their sovereignty. But everyone knows that these states are NATO allies of the United States. Britain is an active member of the bloc and consistently supports and implements U.S. positions and plans both at talks and in the military sphere. France is not formally part of the NATO military organization, but it continues to develop broad military cooperation with the North Atlantic bloc and the bloc's member countries.

The Pentagon itself invariably takes the nuclear arms of the European U.S. allies into consideration in the balance on its own side as an inalienable component of the West's nuclear forces. Recently, for example, a session of the NATO Nuclear Planning Group was held in Portugal to define more precisely a plan for the use of nuclear weapons against the Warsaw Pact countries. The British took a very active part there. If we turn to the British Government's "white paper," it is written in black and white there that "the British nuclear forces are capable of inflicting such damage on the USSR that the Soviet leaders must take them into consideration." One wonders what Britain's sovereignty is worth here, when NATO has a unified plan for the use of nuclear weapons against the USSR and other socialist countries which organically includes British nuclear missiles.

As for France, as the newspaper FRANCE-SOIR wrote, "There is no doubt that the French military potential, whether integrated or not, serves the interests of the Western alliance.... The French nuclear force makes a significant contribution to the overall potential, as well as to the maintenance of equilibrium with the Soviet force." LE MONDE has reported that there exists an accord with the United States and Britain to deploy additional French nuclear means against the USSR in parallel with the corresponding programs in the sphere of NATO "arms upgrading" in response to the mythical "Soviet military threat." In an 11 July interview on the Deutsche Welle radio station FRG Defense Minister M. Woerner declared with full knowledge of the matter: In the event of an armed conflict "France will be on NATO's side from the very first seconds. There is no doubt about this at all."

Thus the fact remains that Britain and France as U.S. and NATO allies, are jointly planning to use their nuclear weapons against the USSR and the other socialist countries. We can find confirmation of this in many official Western sources: In the U.S. defense secretary's reports to Congress on the budget for 1981, 1982, and 1983; in Britain's 1978 "white paper"; in the FRG's 1979 "white paper"; in several annual colections of the London Institute of Strategic Studies (for instance for 1982-1983), and so forth.

The "argument" -- that British and French missiles, as "strategic" missiles, should not be taken into account at the talks on limiting medium-range nuclear weapons in Europe -- is not serious either. Playing with words will not alter the facts that the British and French missiles are weapons of a regional and European scale. Nuclear missile submarines from Britain and France partrol the waters round Europe and are destined for use only in Europe. The missiles carried by these submarines, with a range of between 3,000 and 4,600 km, can reach targets over the whole of the USSR's European territory.

The Reagan administration's stubborn reluctance to change its approach to the inclusion of British and French nuclear missiles in the reckoning can only be explained in one way -- the whole unrealistic stance of the United States is based on the noninclusion of these missiles. You only have to remove this artificially erected barrier, and nothing remains of its false "zero option," its fraudulent "interim decision," or its statements about the USSR's "missile monopoly." This is the chief reason why the United States has made the stumbling block at the talks, clearly striving to protract them and then, citing the "intractability of the Russians," deploy its new missiles in West Europe.

Having nuclear forces not merely on its own territory but also in other regions directly adjacent to the socialist countries' borders, the United States is virtually working toward attempting to enshrine in treaty form its right to maintain this situation, disregarding here the presence in NATO of very substantial British and French nuclear forces as well as the American forces.

The USSR does not aspire to military superiority either globally or in Europe. This does not mean, however, that it must have only precisely the same quanity of medium-range nuclear means in Europe as the United States. Such "equality" would, in fact, mean a dramatic inequality in favor of the United States and its allies.

This is the aim of Europe's "arms upgrading" with new U.S. missiles. It has nothing whatever to do with the West European NATO members' real security needs. We are talking about U.S. attempts to secure a military advantage of the USSR and to threaten the security of the USSR and its allies. So, if we are to talk of a monopoly, it is the U.S. side which would like to retain the privilege of keeping its nuclear weapons near the Soviet border, weapons which are a strategic factor for the Soviet Union.

And not only retain this unfair monopoly position, but also consolidate and strengthen it. As Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, pointed out: "The United States would like to put itself in a monopoly position by deploying near to the USSR nuclear weapons capable of hitting targets deep inside our territory, while the USSR does not have, and, needless to say, according to U.S. logic must not have, a comparable potential anywhere near the United States."

The question of the British and French nuclear arms was raised by the Soviet side as long ago as 1980, at the outset of the talks with the United States. And if there are now those who, calling black white, would like to make out that the demand that these arms be taken into account arose recently, allegedly at the Soviet Union's whim, this can only be described as a deliberate distortion of the truth. That the British and French nuclear arms be taken into account has been the principled stance of the Soviet side right from the start.

The bilateral nature of the Soviet-U.S. talks in Geneva is no reason to exclude the British and French nuclear weapons. Any serious proposal on limiting nuclear arms in Europe must be based on the inclusion of the whole range of means composing the correlation of forces between the Warsaw Pact and NATO in the region and meet the requirement of reciprocity. This is absolutely fundamental.

To ignore the British and French missiles when resolving the problem of reducing nuclear arms in Europe is to jeopardize our security and that of our allies. As has repeatedly been said at the highest level, the Soviet Union will not budge on this question. The demand that the British and French nuclear missiles be counted on NATO's side is not a request but an objective necessity for ensuring our security. Whatever happens, the Soviet Union must and will have the equivalent of the aforementioned missiles. On this score, Yu.V. Andropov said quite clearly: "Try to see the situation from the viewpoint of the Soviet Union and its legitimate interests: On what basis and by what right do they want to leave us unarmed in the face of these British and French nuclear missiles targeted against our country?"

"Clearly, we cannot agree to this and never will. The Soviet Union has just as much right to security as the peoples of America, Britain, France, and other countries."

KORNILOV ON NUCLEAR ARMS RACE IN EUROPE

LD221019 Moscow TASS in English 1002 GMT 22 Aug 83

[Text] Moscow August 22 TASS -- TASS political news analyst Yuriy Kornilov writes:

In view of the major events and processes taking place in the world, there is every reason to say that present-day international developments are determined by the confrontation of the two lines, one aimed at safeguarding and strengthening peace and the other, opposite line at subverting its foundations. This confrontation is particularly manifest in approaches to such an exceptionally important problem as the nuclear arms race in Europe.

On the one hand, there is the USSR's principled and truly constructive stand of peace, which the other day was explicitly reiterated in the course of Yuriy Andropov's meetings and conversations with U.S. senators and the U.S. trade union leader Winpisinger. Our country stands for removing nuclear weapons, both medium-range and tactical, from Europe altogether.

Seeking agreement at the Geneva talks, the USSR has gone half way to meet its partner in many respects; if the Soviet initiatives aimed at ensuring European security were accepted, the overall number of nuclear medium-range systems on the continent would be reduced by about two thirds both on the side of the USSR and on the NATO side.

Moscow is repeatedly stressing that progress at the talks can be ensured not by an increase in the number of missiles, but by the desire to find mutually acceptable solutions on the basis of respect for realities, equality and equal security.

However, those forces in Washington which would like to break down military-strategic parity and are trying to surge ahead at all costs in the military field in order to secure dominance in Europe and the world at large obviously have no interest in finding such solutions. It is those goals that explain the course of the U.S. Administration, which continues to demand the Soviet Union's unilateral disarmament and attempts to leave the USSR defenseless in the face of hundreds of NATO's nuclear missiles. This aggressive course has been given a proper "propaganda backing." Washington is deliberately trying to mislead people, telling the gullible that the deployment of U.S. Pershings and cruises in Western Europe would bring about a "shift" at the Geneva talks.

At the same time, they claim that the West European public "supports" U.S. militarist plans. This claim has just been made in the British OBSERVER by Richard Burt, U.S. assistant secretary of state for European affairs. These allegations are being made at a time when the antimissiles movement on the continent has reached unprecedented proportions and when more than 150 municipal councils in Britain have announced territories under their jurisdiction nuclear weapon-free zones. Trying to "back" his allegations, Burt has cited the returns of the recent British elections. But only about 42 per cent of the votes cast went to the Tories. It was not support for the Conservatives' policy but the majority voting system in the country that enabled the Tories to secure the absolute majority of parliamentary seats.

So what do we have ahead, a stalemate in Geneva to be followed by another round of the wasteful and extremely dangerous nuclear arms race? The Soviet Union is against such a prospect. Yuriy Andropov stressed in his conversation with U.S. senators that the success of the Geneva talks on the limitation of nuclear arms race in Europe was still possible if the United States displayed an interest in an honest agreement on the basis of equality. The USSR will continue to maintain at the Geneva talks its constructive and flexible position in the hope that the American side will at long last revise its negative approach. But if anyone in Washington hopes for the Soviet Union's unilateral concessions to the prejudice of its security interests, these are futile and absolutely groundless hopes.

NORDIC NUCLEAR-FREE ZONE PROPOSALS DISCUSSED

PM191001 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Aug 83 Morning Edition p 5

[I. Andreyev article: "The Supporters and Opponents of Nuclear-Free North"]

[Text] Halting the sinister spiral of nuclear arms buildup and reducing and, subsequently, eliminating the threat of a nuclear apocalypse are the most important tasks of the present day. The front of the peace supporters' struggle against the aggressvie intentions of the Untied States and NATO is broadening throughout the world including the Scandinavian countries and Finland.

More and more people in that region are realizing that NATO's continuing militarist preparations in Europe are threatening peace and stability in the north of the continent, too. That is why influential social organizations and prominent politicians in the Nordic countries are making efforts to secure for northern Europe the opportunity of remaining outside the sphere of conflicts and confrontation and to reduce the nuclear threat to the peoples of this region. In an atmosphere of increasing international tension, Scandinavians are turning increasingly frequently to the idea expressed 20 years ago by U. Kekkonen, former president of Finland -- an idea which has reached special political significance nowadays -- that of declaring northern Europe a nuclear-free zone.

"The main aim of establishing a nuclear-free zone in northern Europe," Swedish Prime Minister O. Palme noted recently, "is to strengthen the Scandinavian countries' security." Representatives of the public in those countries recently conducted a series of actions under the watchwords of combating nuclear arms, preventing thermonuclear catastrophe, and struggling for general disarmament and peace. In those actions, a prominent place was assigned to an appeal for the creation of a nuclear-free zone in northern Europe.

The Danish city of Silkeborg was the venue for a "Peace Meeting-83" in which activists of the peace supporters' movements in Denmark, Norway, Finland, and Sweden participated. They sent a message to Yu. V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, to U.S. President R. Reagan, and to the leaders of the north European countries, in which they described how they intended to struggle to preserve peace and detente.

The Soviet head of state's message of reply fully shares the concern of the participants in the meeting regarding the U.S. and NATO intentions to deploy new U.S. nuclear missiles in Europe, and stresses that the transformation of the north of our continent into a nuclear-free zone could be an important step toward ridding Europe of nuclear weapons. These words of Yu. V. Andropov have a particularly significant ring in light of the new Soviet proposals put forward by him during Finnish Persident M. Koivisto's recent official visit to the Soviet Union. It was then clearly confirmed that the USSR does not merely sympathize with the idea of creating a nuclear-free zone in northern Europe, but is also prepared to assist in establishing it.

As is well known, the Soviet side has repeatedly expressed a readiness to assume a commitment not to use nuclear weapons against those north European countries that would form part of a nuclear-free zone. In moving toward the views expressed in these countries, the USSR has declared its readiness to examine the question of some important measures regarding its own territory adjacent to the zone which would help to strengthen the zone's nuclear-free status.

Supplementing this principled stance with the possibility of discussing the question of granting the Baltic nuclear-free status was, in the opinion of the public at large, a further positive move in proclaiming the north a nuclear-free zone. The Finnish newspaper SUOMEN SOSIALIDEMOKRAATTI has written in this context that "in any event, the USSR's renewed and expanded proposal shows its firm desire to meet the other side halfway and to create the political conditions for a nuclear-free zone in northern Europe." The comments by President M. Koivisto in an interview in the newspaper KANSAN UUTISET were similar.

A similar standpoint was expressed in the journal TIDEN by the prominent politician M.B. Theorin, head of the Swedish delegation at the Geneva Disarmament Committee, who stressed that the creation of such a zone should be viewed as an important element of Sweden's movement and broad public circles in the Nordic countries.

Against the backdrop of such a well-informed and businesslike approach to the maintenance of peace in northern Europe, the "arguments" put forward by NATO's bellicose circles, who are continuing to use the hackneyed "Soviet military threat" to oppose the creation of a nuclear-free north or are ignoring this topical question, look grotesquely absurd. The aim is clear -- it is to enable the Scandinavian NATO members to withstand the pressure of the peace-loving movements in their own countries and the peace offensive in the socialist states.

It is significant that President Reagan has not even replied to the appeal by the participants of the Silkeborg meeting. What is more, he has expressed his own position on this score clearly himself: "Talk of a nuclear-free zone in northern Europe, the Baltic, or in other areas cannot be taken seriously." Such is the approach of the present U.S. Administration to today's fundamental issues.

What is the position of the Scandinavian NATO members' governments? Unfortunately, despite a verbal smokescreen, it essentially coincides with the U.S. position even though the proposal to declare northern Europe a nuclear-free zone has acquired even greater significance in connection with the planned deployment of new U.S. medium-range nuclear missiles on the territory of a number of West European NATO members. It is no secret that the proposed flightpaths of some of the cruise missiles would pass not only over Denmark and Norway but also over Sweden and Finland.

In attempting to justify their negative attitude toward the creation of a nuclear-free zone in northern Europe, pro-NATO politicians in the Scandinavian countries are citing the fact that Norway and Denmark have officially refused to deploy nuclear weapons and foreign military bases on their territory in peacetime and that nuclear weapons have never been and are not now stationed in Finland or Sweden. But after all, it is common knowledge that stockpiles of weapons and equipment are being created on the Scandinavian NATO members' soil for use by shock NATO divisions of the most diverse type.

The Western press notes that Washington is thereby trying not only to bypass the "base policy" of Norway and Denmark but also to involve them more closely in its nuclear strategy. Swedish Foreign Minister L. Bodstrom has noted with justification that in the event of war, conditions would develop which apply to all NATO allies. In that eventuality, military actions would be carried out by all forces, including actions involving the use of nuclear weapons." Thus both Norway and Denmark, despite the particular features of their position, are hostages of Washington's nuclear strategy.

The conviction, widespread in northern Europe, that the renunciation by those countries of NATO's nuclear option is the precondition for the creation of a nuclear-free zone in the region is quite understandable. Recently there have been increasingly frequent attempts to conceal the reluctance to being able to discuss the question of the zone behind a need to examine it "in the broad European context" and in direct dependence on "clarifications" at the Soviet-U.S. nuclear arms limitation talks in Geneva.

In acknowledging the existence of a certain interdependence here, O. Palme has at the same time quite reasonably said that "work on the creation of a nuclear-free zone in the north must nevertheless not be subordinated to progress at the European talks. Progress on the question of the zone can of its own accord be a constructive contribution to the efforts to gradually reduce the role and quantity of nuclear arms in Europe." In other words, the idea of a nuclear-free zone in northern Europe has acquired the significance of a constant factor exerting a positive influence on the discussion of the problems of strengthening international security.

Finnish Prime Minister K. Sorsa has stressed that his country and Sweden "still believe that the creation of a zone would be beneficial not only for the Nordic countries but also for other parts of Europe where similar decisions may be taken." Whether the opponents of detente like it or not, they are forced to take account of the great support that the idea of a nuclear-free north enjoys nowadays. That can be confirmed by the fact that great attention was paid to the question of the zone during the recent unofficial meeting of the prime ministers of the Scandinavian countries and of Finland in Helsinki. The Norwegian and Danish representatives found it difficult to justify their negative attitude toward the zone's creation in their public statements.

The work geared toward transferring this issue to a specific, practical plan continues.

As for the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, their principled position was reaffirmed with full clarity in the joint statement by the seven fraternal countries' leading party and state figures in June. In that statement they supported the implementation of the proposals on the creation of nuclear-free zones in northern Europe, the Balkans, and other parts of Europe, and the holding of the appropriate talks on these questions.

WEEKLY 'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE'

LD211745 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0715 GMT 21 Aug 83

['International Observers Roundtable' program with Boris Vasilyevich Andrianov, All-Union Radio foreign affairs commentator; Dmitry Antonovich Volskiy, member of the NOVOYE VREMYA editorial board; and Vadim Nikolayevich Nekrasov, KOMMUNIST international affairs observer]

Nuclear, Space Arms Race

[Text] [Andrianov] Good day, comrades. The events of the past week have once again vividly shown the international public that the Soviet Union considers its paramount task to be the attempt to avert a dangerous development of the international situation and to strengthen the peace that the Soviet people need so much to implement their plans for internal development in order to improve the lives of millions of ordinary working people. This is shown by the contents of the talks that took place during Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov's reception at the Kremlin for U.S. trade union officials and senators. In the course of these meetings the Soviet leader not only confirmed our principled position on the most important international events, but also further developed a number of proposals previously made by the Soviet Union and came out with fresh constructive initiatives attesting to the goodwill and determination of our country to strengthen peace and the peoples' security.

One of the key issues of the present day is undoubtedly Soviet-American relations, now strained in virtually all spheres. However, Comrade Andropov noted, this has not come about through the choice of the Soviet side. The Soviet Union would like to have a level of agreement with the United States that would ensure normal, stable, and good relations to the mutual benefit of both sides and to the benefit of the cause of universal peace. If indeed some people are reckoning on achieving superiority over the USSR in an atmosphere of tension and in a game without rules, then this, Yuriy Vladimirovich stressed, is a dangerous miscalculation. In this respect the question of where relations between the two countries go from here depends, as incidentally much else does, on whether an outcome acceptable to both sides will be found at the Geneva talks on the problem of nuclear armaments in Europe, and on whether success will be achieved in halting a very dangerous new round of the arms race in this area.

In his conversation with the American senators, Comrade Andropov recalled the Soviet Union's warning that the deployment of U.S. Pershing and cruise missiles in Europe will have far-reaching consequences that will inevitably affect the United States itself. The Americans, the Soviet leader stated frankly, will also feel the difference between the situation existing before deployment and that existing afterwards. This sober warning is addressed to those Washington politicians who have a negative approach to the Geneva talks and show no interest in an honest accord on the basis of equality. After all, the nuclear arms race in Europe has now become a kind of nerve center in international relations. It is this nuclear arms race in Europe that could become the source of a rapid and sharp exacerbation of the threat of a new world war. In this connection Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov stressed that success for the Geneva talks on limiting nuclear armaments in Europe is still possible, but only if the United States shows interest in an honest accord on the basis of equality. We do not advise anyone to count on one-sided concessions by the Soviet Union to the detriment of its security interests, Comrade Andropov said. Questions concerning the limitation of strategic armaments can also only be settled on the basis of equality.

[Volskiy] Yes, our position is precise, clear, frank, honest, consistent, and principled. The Soviet Union does not intend to intimidate anyone.

It is merely calling for a sober assessment of the existing situation, for a most responsible analysis of the possible consequences of a further race in strategic armaments, and for a display of political will not to allow an increase in the threat of nuclear war.

[Andrianov] Our country is also pointing out realisitc ways to achieve this goal. Receiving the American senators, Comrade Andropov drew their attention particulary to the USSR's proposal for a freeze on the strategic nuclear arsenals of the Soviet Union and the United States. The essence of this proposal boils down not only to not increasing the numbers of missiles already in existence, but also to abandoning the development and testing of new types and kinds of strategic armaments, and to maximally limiting the modernization of existing weapons. At the same time we agree to a broader option going beyond the framework of strategic armaments; that is, we agree to a freezing of all the components of the nuclear arsenals of the Soviet Union and the United States.

What would this provide? First, it would provide an example for other countries and, second, agreement on a freeze would immediately suspend the dangerous process of an unrestrained nuclear arms race. After all, this is the dream of all peoples, and as a result quite a different political atmosphere would arise. It would make it possible to strive more easily to reach agreement on a reduction of the stockpiles of these weapons. Surely this is dictated by the interests of peace and mankind's security.

At his meeting with the American senators, Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov came out with a further really important initiative. I can see that you wish to speak, Vadim Nikolayevich.

[Nekrasov] Yes, the initiative concerns the question of the danger of an arms race in space. First of all I would like to note the circumstance that was stressed by Comrade Andropov, namely, that mankind is faced with the terrible and real danger of the arms race being spread into space. In this connection, as Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov noted, the Soviet Union deems it necessary that agreement be reached on a total ban on the testing and deployment of any space-based weapon, whether aimed at objects in space or at objects on earth. It has been further proposed that the question of antisatellite weapons be settled in a radical fashion, that is, it has been proposed that agreement be reached on eliminating antisatellite systems already in existence and on banning the creation of new systems. The most important thing in this connection is that the Soviet Union undertakes the commitment not to be the first to put any kinds of antisatellite weapons into space -- that is, it is introducing a unilateral moratorium on such launches for as long as other states, including the United States of course, refrain from placing in space any kind of antisatellite weapon.

[Volskiy] But Vadim Nikolayevich, we already know what this prospect is linked with. It is linked with the Pentagon's plans to create weapons, including laser weapons, ray weapons, and other similar weapons, which could be used to strike against another country's space objects and to strike directly at targets on earth from circumterrestrial space.

[Nekrasov] The issue here, above all, is what is guiding the United States -- or more accurately, U.S. reactionaries -- in the striving to transfer the arms race into space, and what has been guiding them in the development and implementation of other arms race programs. This was expressed well in Comrade Andropov's talk with the American senators, and the point has already been noted by Boris Vasilyevich.

Washington wants to play without any rules in the hope that it will thereby achieve military superiority and dictate its terms to the Soviet Union. This is undoubedly another miscalculation, a miscalculation that is dangerous not only for America but also for the whole world, since, if the plans for putting modern weapons into space were implemented, the arms race would take on such a monstrous shape that it is even difficult to talk about it at present.

This is why the Soviet Union's proposals, about which I have been speaking, are of such exceptional importance.

Tension Escalation

[Volskiy] I would like to turn to the part of Comrade Andropov's talk with the American senators in which the Soviet side pointed out the impermissibility of outside interference in the affairs of states and of threats to use armed force, and where the imperative need to eliminate hotbeds of tension by peaceful means was stressed. After all, these seemingly local hotbeds do indeed have the characteristic of expanding and even spreading and merginging with one another. Special terms have appeared for this: Upward escalation -- vertical escalation -- the general growth of international tension; and sideways escalation -- horizontal escalation -- the fact that tension spreads to various regions of the world. We see this at present in Chad and in Central America. It may seem that this is some sort of spontaneous process. Incidentally, American propaganda often plays up this version. But what spontaneity is there in the fact that the Americans themselves set up a Central Command in the zone of the Indian Ocean? Those same Americans are now carrying out the biggest maneuvers in their entire history,
the Rapid Deployment Forces, in Egypt, Sudan, and Somalia, in which the American soldiers number, by themselves, 10,000. These are not just soldiers, but specially trained landing troops, Marines, specialists in so-called antipartisan operations, and so on. The same holds for Central America. Much is being written about the provocative maneuvers there. I'd like to mention a figure: 16,000 U.S. military personnel on the ships that have arrived off the coast of Nicaragua, plus at least 5,000, and perhaps even 6,000 in the land exercises in Honduras; in other words, altogether the Americans alone total at least 22,000.

[Andrianov] Dmitriy Antonovich, another noticeable thing about these exercises is their extraordinary duration. At first they were to go on until November, now it is reported that they've decided to extend them to March.

[Volskiy] That very fact also shows the secret aims of such a large-scale military operation as is being carried out in Central America. First, it is meant to create conditions for a direct military intervention, if the American leadership should consider it feasible, in Nicaragua or El Salvador for instance. Second, and this is perhaps no less important, to provide for a permanent U.S. military presence in Central America at the approaches to the major Latin American countries, Mexico in the north, above all, but also Brazil and Argentina in the south.

Although there are now many other conflict situations, perhaps more acute than at the present moment in the Near East, still I think that it is in the Near East that the most potentially dangerous of the local conflicts remains. The reason is not just oil, but other factors too: The fact that the region is situated near the frontiers of the socialist community, the fact that Israel is showing a particular inclination toward expansion and aggression, a particular belligerence. What characterizes the present situation in the Near East? Above all, the fact that it has now become clear that Washington and Tel Aviv have not succeeded, and, evidently, won't succeed, in implementing in practice the capitulationist agreement that they foisted on Lebanon last spring.

[Nekrasov] This must also be one of the reasons for the reliance on military force in the Near East?

[Volskiy] Well, not only on their own, American, forces, but also on the Israeli military machine. Their actions are being coordinated ever more closely; the actions, that is, of the American troops and the Israeli army that are now carrying out maneuvers and establishing a permanent presence, you might say, in the Near Eastern zone.

Israel continues to threaten Syria in the Al-Biqa' Valley and from the Golan Heights. As far as these "Bright Star" maneuvers are concerned, this year they have come to be aimed quite definitely at a region neighboring the main zone of the Near East conflict: Chad and Libya -- Libya above all. Essentially, what makes Chad so attractive to the Americans is that they would like to turn it into a bridgehead aimed against Libya, or in any case into a country hostile to Libya, to set up a regime there that would be used for bringing influence to bear on Libya, and perhaps even for aggression against Libya. The scheme is to squeeze Libya in a semicircle of hostile regimes: from the east, Egypt; from the southeast, Sudan; and from the south they have Chad in mind. Then from the north, from the direction of the Mediterranean, there they have the American 6th Fleet and the aircraft carrier Eisenhower with its escort vessels, which has for a long time now been crusing close to the Libyan coast. One U.S. television network, NBC, has reported that the Reagan administration wants some sort of incident to occur between that aircraft carrier and the Libyan Armed Forces so that they can use it for military provocations, to teach Libya a lesson as they put it, along with such countries as Cuba and Nicaragua.

[Andrianov] Well, it seems to me that Washington, their placeman in Chad, Hissein Habre, obviously cannot hold out on his own.

[Volskiy] Here, Boris Vasiliyevich, we can recall that American placemen in many other places are unable to remain in power without outside support. El Salvador is the latest, but by no means the only example, even in Central America. So it is not Nicaragua or Cuba that is being taught a lesson there, but the American themselves. The Reagan administration is obviously not benefitting from the lesson. The impression is that it is deliberately exacerbating the situation in various parts of Asia, Africa, and Latin America, intentionally whipping up conflicts there, and this is being done in order to make it easier to implement U.S. militaristic plans on a global scale, particularly, perhaps above all the missile plans in Europe that outflank the widening antiwar movement.

Monopolistic Support

[Nekrasov] It is, of course, a matter of concerted action, since the threat of war in the modern world arises both from the global claims of imperialism and from its aggressive actions on a regional scale. Both are directed toward one aim and have one task, namely, to try to take social revenge, to push back the world of socialism, and, if possible, destroy it. We are dealing with a phenomenon that is inherent not only in American imperialism. It is also a broader phenomenen. And to what Dmitriy Antonovich has said on these matters, I would like to add a curious statement by a U.S. ABC television network correspondent, (McWorth). It refers directly to the events in Chad. France, the correspondent says, is coming back to Africa because its economic interests in that continent demand it. The economic interests are not, of course, those of France, not its national interests, not the interests of the French people, but the interests of the monopolies, the interests of French capital. Thus, at the foundation of this interventionist policy of whipping up tension lie the claims of the monopolies, their thirst for expansion, and their fear of losing the markets and sources of raw materials that they have at their disposal. Here is another interesting confirmation, this time from the United States. One of the pillars of American monopolistic capital, David Rockefeller, who was himself for many years the head of Chase Manhattan Bank, recently gave an interview to the Japanese paper ASAHI. In that interview he declared: We will not allow the Soviet Union to create governments in Central America close to the USSR. President Reagan considers it necessary to retaliate, and that is quite right.

[Volskiy] Well, Vadim Nikolayevich, I don't think David Rockefeller really thought the Soviet Union wants to set up any governments, or anything else of the kind, in Central America.

One must assume that Rockefeller is a sufficiently intelligent and well-informed person to be able to understand the true causes of the present revolutionary explosion in Central America. They arise from something quite different, they are rooted in socioeconomic phenomena, in the plight of the peoples of that region who have lived for many decades, and live still, in hopeless poverty, deprived of their rights. The thing that is causing those peoples to rise up and engage in a resolute struggle is not any mythical Soviet arms, but precisely the will of the broad masses of the people in El Salvador, in Nicaragua, and in the other Latin American countries, their desire to have done with destitution, with the arbitrary rule of the big landowners, the generals and allies of those landowners, and of the other forces of oppression, the oligarchy.

[Nekrasov] That's right. I think we'll leave that statement by David Rockefeller to his conscience. But this approval and support for Reagan's actions, at a time when U.S. public opinion and many sober-minded politicians in the United States are expressing serious concern about them, are clear approval for this policy by leading circles of U.S. monopoly capital. They are the sources of this strategy of tension.

U.S. Third World Policy

[Andrianov] Vadim Nikolayevich, you have given us a very clear description of U.S. policy in the complex conditions which have now come about on the world arena. In pursuing its policy of confrontation in international affairs Washington is taking an ever harder line toward the developing countries. Increasing pressure is being applied on these states and on their independence from the other side of the ocean. We have already spoken about Central America and the Near East. We have mentioned the events in Chad. To this one could add the expansion of U.S. assistance to puppet groupings in Angola, the Washington administration's active moves to block the possibility of granting independence to Namibia, and the scarcely disguised connivance of the United States in the aggressive actions of the racist South African regime against independent African states. On the Asian Continent the White House is striving to intensify its undeclared war against the Afghan people. It is providing protection for the Kampuchean counterrevolution. It is actively supporting separatist elements in a number of regions of India. Those are far from being all the aspects of Washington's present policy toward the developing countries. Even that compressed list gives grounds for asserting that by all accounts the Reagan administration simply does not visualize its approach to the developing states without a big stick in its hands.

[Nekrasov] Boris Vasilyevish, it would be even more accurate to say that in such cases Washington operates with the big stick in its hands and anti-Soviet rhetoric on its lips. After all, it is a fact that the Reagan team considers it to be more politically advantageous and profitable to foist its wishes on young states in the framework of the global anti-Soviet strategy.

[Andrianov] That is a valid and very pertinent remark. But what lies behind such an approach? If one assesses the evidence soberly, one can see that Washington regards the zone of developing countries as a battleground between East and West. This point of view is of paramount importance in U.S. policy in this zone. The anti-Soviet verbiage, the idle conjectures about an increasing Soviet threat and other demagogic strategems of the same kind, are all nothing more than the hackneyed methods of political camouflage. They have become badly worn through constant usage. Washington resorts to them whenever it is trying to screen its own neocolonialist designs in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, whenever it is striving to camouflage its actions aimed at undermining regimes in developing countries which it does not care for. How can one forget here that the Reagan administration stubbornly tries to depict upsurge in the national liberation movement in any country as none other than a direct result of manipulation by the hand of Moscow.

There is another objective which the United States is aiming at in its aspiration to depict the developing countries as an East-West battleground: Washington clearly hopes that the just demands which the developing countries are making of the imperialist powers, in seeking their agreement to the establishment of equitable economic relations, will be drowned and rendered inaudible by the noisy beating of the militaristic drums and the bitter anti-Soviet howling of hysterical female politicians. Such relations do not form part of the imperialists' plans. Does one need to prove, after this, that imperialism's policy of whipping up tension directly affects all countries and peoples, including the developing states, by inflicting ever more painful blows on their fundamental and vitally important interests in literally every sphere? Is it not the case that important changes in the foreign policy posture of developing countries have lately become a logical phenomenon? In most of them both broad circles of public opinion and politicians are becoming increasingly aware that imperialism's aggressive course is also directed against states which have liberated themselves.

Soviet Relations, Afghanistan

This being the case, what can be unusual about the fact that the developing countries are moving toward standing up to imperialism over the most vital questions of our day -- the questions of war, peace, and disarmament -- and are putting these problems in the forefront of their international policy? All this is quite logical. The mythical hand of Moscow and other conjectures about the intrigues of the communists have nothing whatsoever to do with this. It is Washington's imperial policy itself, in all its hegemonist and aggressive manifestations, which engenders and multiplies the ranks of opponents of this course on all continents. And, of course, the example of our country plays an immense role. The Soviet Union counters the imperialist policy of diktat and subjection with its own line in international affairs involving the developing countries. This is a policy of true equity, friendship, and cooperation.

So there is nothing strange about the choice being made by young states. Even those states where the capitalist system has gained a hold need equitable international cooperation and durable peace as they strive to overcome economic backwardness. Therefore, most of them rightly regard ties with our country and with the socialist community as a whole as a way of strengthening their independence. In its relations with the developing countries the Soviet Union pursues a policy of mutually advantageous cooperation while fully respecting their sovereignty and not interfering in their affairs. This, incidentally, helps to increase the role which they play on the world arena in spite of the attempts of the Western powers to keep the developing countries onthe sidelines of international politics.

[Volskiy] It is appropriate to note that the Soviet Union maintains relations of close cooperation with various developing states. But the Soviet Union has established particularly close relations with countries which have chosen a socialist orientation. The number of such young states continues to increase. This is one of the distinctive features of our times. As Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov has noted, in our epoch it is socialism which is the most consistent defender of healthy principles in international relations, of the interests of detente and peace, of the interests of every people and all mankind.

[Andrianov] Our country became an initiator of these healthy principles in international relations with its very first steps on the world arena. There are abundant examples of this. For instance, 2 days ago the people of Afghanistan celebrated the day of restoration of independence. This independence was won back in stubborn fighting against foreign colonizers in 1919. In the very first days of the emergence of an independent Afghanistan, Soviet Russian, which was still young in those days, declared its recognition, established friendly and equitable relations with it, and took practical steps to assist the people of a neighboring country.

In subsequent years Soviet-Afghan relations have developed fruitfully in the interests of the peoples of both countries, on the basis of the principles of good-neighborliness, equity, noninterference in internal affairs, and respect for national independence and territorial integrity.

Following the April 1978 revolution in Afghanistan these relations have risen to a new level. They have become relations of genuine fraternal friendship and international solidarity. New opportunities have opened up for still broader all-round cooperation in political, economic, and cultural spheres. If it were not for the subversive activities of the counterrevolution and imperialism's interference in Afghanistan's internal affairs, that country would achieve still greater success in the construction of a new society. Nevertheless, it is obvious that imperialism and reaction are not capable of stopping the process of revolutionary development in the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. All their endeavors in this direction are doomed to failure, just like their futile attempts to discredit this young, sovereign state. It now has diplomatic relations with almost 70 countries. The international prestige of Afghanistan, which together with all progressive forces in the world stands for peace and security for all mankind, has increased.

Our meeting at the roundtable has come to an end. Goodbye. All the best.

'INTERNATIONAL SITUATION: QUESTIONS & ANSWERS'

LD192059 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0930 GMT 19 Aug 83

["International Situation: Questions and Answers" program presented by Sergey Pravdin [not further identified] with Anatoliy Naimushin, Radio Moscow correspondent in Sofia; Yuriy Kobaladze, Radio Moscow correspondent in London; Juan Cobo, international affairs journalist for LATINSKAYA AMERIKA: and Nikolay Khokhlov, observer for IZVESTIYA]

Central America 'Adventurism'

[Excerpts] [Pravdin] Let us continue the broadcast. Many listeners express anxiety and concern in their letters about the situation which has arisen in Central America. Comrades Fomichev from Moscow, Lopin from Riga, Antayen from Novosibirsk, and Matveykovo from Serpukhov, ask about the situation in this region. Foreign affairs journalist Juan Cobo will reply to these questions. Over to you.

[Cobo] U.S. policies in Central America, and incidentally in other parts of the world and regarding other problems, are totally adventuristic; and adventures, as is well-known, have the most unpredictable results. It is therefore simply impossible to exclude any kind of extreme steps being taken by the White House, both as a result of losing control over the whole course of events, and because decisions are suddenly taken there in total contradiction to common sense. This circumstance is compounded by purely psychological factors. President Reagan, as the U.S. press itself asserts, is a gambler by nature, and has chosen many of his team members and by the same principle.

[Pravdin] Before he came to power, Reagan promised that he would deal swiftly with the revolutionaries of Central American countries. For this, it was said, it is necessary to merely apply force in a decisive manner.

[Cobo] Exactly. This directive was formulated in the famous document of the Santa Fe Committee. But 3 years have passed and where are the results? It has not been possible to untangle the situation in Central America or to cut it like the Gordian Knot. On the contrary, it is becoming more and more negative yearly for Washington. The Reagan administration is trying to hide all these policy failures with bold demonstrations of its military might in that area.

On the other hand, the U.S. war machine has become larger and more cumbersome in past years than ever before, and it is necessary to keep it in a state of combat readiness. Finally, as the Americans themselves admit, the CIA's determined and undeclared war against the Sandinistas has not had the desired result of overthrowing the country's revolutionary government. Now the Pentagon has joined with the CIA. A war of starvation and attrition has been declared against the Nicaraguans. This is very hard to bear, but the Sandinistas declare that they long ago foresaw this turn of events and prepared for it from the very beginning, so that in extremes they would be capable of mobilizing the 500,000-strong army to repulse the interventionists. Bearing in mind the dogged heroism with which the Nicaraguan people struggled against the Somoza regime, which always enjoyed Washington's full support, one would think that the imperialists will be unable to impose their will on these people.

As we see, the Central American revolutionary liberation movement, in answer to the imperialists' attempts to suppress it, is becoming stronger every year, and there is every reason to assume that this tendency will continue.

[Pravdin] We have just discussed the truth behind the Reagan administration's actions in Central America. However, its real essence, especially recently, has been more and more often camouflaged with talk about Washington's love of peace and hidden by all sorts of demarches. Recently, for example, a special Central America commission was formed at the White House. What is the aim of this special commission, our regular listener from Taganrog, Kotov asks.

[Cobo] Suffice it to say that the head of the commission is Henry Kissinger, although representatives of both the Republican and Democratic parties have been included as well, and even a certain number of fairly independent people. But if one recalls that amongst Kissinger's merits is the coordination of subversive activities against the Salvadoran Government and Allende's Chile, then one has a fair idea of what kind of experience this politicians has in Latin American affairs.

Nevertheless, Reagan, who lately delivers speeches on the problems of Central America almost every 2 or 3 days, has declared that the commission aims to achieve the establishment of more cordial relations between the United States and the whole of Latin America.

In actual fact there is no warmth at all in these relations, and the events in Central America have only cooled them still further, as have the Reagan administration's maneuvering, the creation of all kinds of commissions, talk about peace, and the lie asserting that the problems in Central America have been caused by infiltration of this area by certain communist countries, and so on. All this is simply a smokescreen for Washington's unceasing attempts to turn the situation in this region in its favor by force, and force alone.

[Pravdin] Comrade Klinko from Dnepropetrovsk writes in his letter, "How do the events in Central America affect the international situation as a whole?" What have you to say on this?

[Cobo] The events in that distant part of the world naturally affect the whole situation in today's world. If one delves more deeply, it is impossible not to be aware of the fact that the Reagan administration is constantly flexing its muscles first in one and then in another of the planet's hot spots. The imperialists will not let one of these spots cool, whether in Central America or the Near East, and recently even in southern Africa.

The United States meddles everywhere in local conflicts, provoking explosive situations. The aim of this strategy, which is being especially actively pursued under Reagan, is clear -- to hold the world in a permanently tense state and increase confrontations on all fronts.

[Khokholov] It is this that is used to justify Washington's course aimed at an unprecedented arms race, the refusal to conduct peaceful talks, and attempt to settle contention with the help of political settlements. In this way the Reagan administration, as it were, makes good the (?pledges) granted to the military-industrial complex, whose weight in decision making in the United States has sharply increased.

[Cobo] This is, I agree, an extremely important side of the question, but to deal with matters in broader terms, this geopolitical strategy, whose theater has now become the whole world, organically arises from the aggressive essence of imperialism itself, whose true face has become especially clear under Reagan.

I have often heard U.S. politicians and journalists express the thought that every cloud has a silver lining. Now, unlike the period of the Carter presidency and the times of Kennedy for example, the White House stands unmasked in its true nature. This leads to the loss of illusions, and the essence of the matter becomes more clear.

[Pravdin] However, many West European states unfortunately follow in the wake of these irresponsible U.S. policies.

[Cobo] This is unfortunately so, and into the bargain the French Government, which in the past opposed Washington's policies in Central America, especially after the socialists came to power, has now softened its criticism of the White House.

Events in Chad

The events in Chad, where France has become involved in a dangerous adventure relying on U.S. support, have had an effect here. Even so, anxiety in Europe is growing both among the broad masses of the public and in government circles. This is weakening the already shaky faith of the U.S. allies, and in the long run all this is fraught with negative consequences for U.S. policy as a whole.

[Pravdin] Much interest is shown by our listeners in the situation in the Republic of Chad. Comrades Sivkov from Pskov, Marsenrovich from Minsk, and Zhulkova from Tula Oblast ask to be told in greater detail about this country, not only about the present events, but also its economy, population, and nature. Nikolay Petrovich, if you do not mind let us start with this.

[Khokhlov] Speaking about Chad one must not forget for a moment that it is one of the least developed countries of Africa. This has a direct effect on the political atmosphere in the country. For example, the strata of local intelligentsia is very thin. Moreover, some of them have been and still are under the very strong influence of the former colonial guardians. From this stems the shapelessness of political parties, their weakness, inprecision, and at times confusion in their slogans and aims. All of this was fertile soil for bringing about intercommunal strife, and these have hardly ceased since 1966. Events in Chad, it seemed, developed according to the standard laws of any political detective novel -- a frequent change of characters with departures, and arrivals of the very same characters. It is sufficient to say that the leaders of the present hostile groups, I mean Goukouni Oueddei, chairman of the Transitional Government of National Unity, leader of the National Liberation Front, Frolinat, and Hissein Habre, head of the present regime in Ndjamena. In these troubled times they have both occupied the highest posts of the state.

The Organisation of African Unity [OAU] has frequently shown attention to the events in Chad and tried to undertake the role of friendly mediator so as to settle this purely internal conflict in Chad by peaceful means.

However, events got out -- one could even say -- burst out of control, which created the opportunity for foreign interference. This had been observed in Chad previously, but not on such a dangerous scale as now.

[Pravdin] How is one to explain the participation of a Zairean unit in the events in Chad?

[Khokhlov] I would remind you that the Congo -- that is, the present Zaire, in the initial years of its independence was a drunken revel of the imperialist powers and witnessed much on its difficult path. After the tragic death of Partice Lumumba there came to power people who did not conceal their liking for the West, turning to it every time for help in critical and crisis periods -- and there have been many of these in Congo-Zaire. Rebellious movements in Shaba Province aimed at overthrowing the existing regime, as is known, have sprung up on more than one occasion. During the most recent flare-up in 1978 this was quelled with the aid of these same French paratroops. It is hardly a coincidence that at the moment when the crisis in Chad became aggravated Zairean President General Mobutu visited Washington and Paris. Zaire is acting on its own responsibility without taking account of the OAU position. Moreover, it defiantly ignores its opinion. Its adherence to the West turned out to be greater than African continental considerations.

[Pravdin] Much noise has been raised in the Western press about the alleged participation of another African country -- Libya -- in the Chad events.

[Khokhlov] Well, this is being done to distract attention according to rather primitive logic. Libya is Chad's northern neighbor, and its republican system, its irreconcilable position with regard to the West, its aid to the national liberation movements on the continent, have always been and still are the object of furious attacks from all pro-colonial forces.

Washington and certain other Western capitals are actively using the events in Chad to unleash and anti-Libyan campaign.The Pentagon is threatening to establish a naval blockade and is moving the most modern naval vessels to Libyan shores. Thus, the West's insidious plans are becoming revealed in full -- to draw into the Chad conflict not just one but several African countries with the clear intention of setting them against each other and using the Chad events to inflame a wider -- one could say a global -- military hotbed in Africa. It would not be an exaggeration to say, if one draws the conclusion, that all sovereign Africa is faced with the most serious tests, and the continent as a whole cannot but feel the extremely negative consequences of the West's perfidious actions in Chad.

This latest conflict distracts forces and violates unity. It introduces a split in the ranks of those struggling for the final removal or racism and apartheid from the map of Africa. In any such complication when African countries have allowed themselves to be drawn into discords which are to the advantage only of imperialism and colonalism, the Republic of South Africa authorities immediately unleashed armed provocations against neighboring sovereign states. Now, when blood is flowing in Chad, the Pretoria authorities have noticeably stepped up their criminal activities against independent Angola.

In conclusion I would like to dwell on the nature of the alliance in Chad of France and the United States. It is not easy to evaluate it simply or even to pass it off with statements that Paris is following Washington, for the United States is dissatisfied with France's slowness. Washington officials are putting a certain amount of pressure on the French Government, urging it on to more effective interference in the internal affairs of Chad.

But here one sees the general question -- how far will France go in interfering in the affairs of the Republic of Chad. Will it agree to pull the chestnuts out of the fire for the Pentagon. The French press is full of articles on this theme, although there is not yet any sharp condemnation of their government's actions in Chad. It is hard to forecast what steps France will take in the near future. But one thing is very clear. The adventure in Chad will not bring any laurels to Paris but will only damage the prestige of which the false zealots of France's national dignity now talk with such aplomb.

The United States, which is stimulating militaristic emotions in its NATO partner, knows full well that there are pro-colonial elements in France closely linked with Pretoria and other enemies of contemporary Africa. Moreover, France is linked by treaties on military aid to 17 African countries. Units of French troops have been sent to many places on the African Continent, and it is not difficult to move them to Chad. But this is just one side of the affair, the purely military side. This must not be ignored, but it must not be moved into the foreground. The main thing now is to extinguish the conflict in Chad. This question is being discussed in the UN Security Council. Certain steps should be expected from the OAU, which has already demanded the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Chad. Leading Soviet circles, as was stated, consider that the military involvement of Western powers in the affairs of Chad is in the interests of the imperialist forces which are trying to create situations of confrontation in Africa and to whip up conflicts among the countries of this continent for their own narrow aims which have nothing in common with the interets of the peoples of Africa. A peaceful settlement of the situation in Chad is the only way to extinguish the hotbed of war, bring calm to this country, and rid Africa of a dangerous, drawn-out, and totally unncessary conflict.

MOSCOW TV'S 20 AUG 'STUDIO 9' PROGRAM

OW220701 Moscow Domestic Television Service in Russian 0845 GMT 20 Aug 83

["Studio 9" program moderated by Professor Valentin Sergeyevich Zorin, political observer of Soviet television and radio, with Leonid Mitrofanovich Zamyatin, chief of the International Information Department of the CPSU Central Committee]

Global Situation Aggravation

[Text] [Zorin] Hello, comrades. We are again meeting in "Studio 9" of the Ostankino Television Center to talk about topical problems of world politics. Recently "Studio 9" received a lot of letters with questions which, I think, are of great interest to our entire audience. Therefore we have asked Leonid Mitrofanovich Zamyatin, chief of the International Information Department of the CPSU Central Committee, to take on the task of answering your questions.

A common theme in many of the letters that we have received is our television viewers' concern over the continuing aggravation of the international situation. Here, for instance, is what Comrade Melnichenko, a worker from Novosibirsk Oblast, writes: The antiwar movement, in which tens of millions of people are taking part, is growing in every country, including the United States. The antiwar movement has never had such scope. But meanwhile the military danger is not only not decreasing but, on the contrary, it is increasing. How can this be explained? Leonid Mitrofanovich, I propose to begin our talk today with the answer to this question.

[Zamyatin] I think that this concern is correct. It reflects the attitudes of millions of people. This is because at the present time, as a result of U.S. policies, especially with the coming of Reagan to the White House, there is a most dangerous destabilization of the whole system of interstate relations, an intensification of the arms race, and a serious increase in the military threat.

We have spoken many times about the fact that the Reagan administration is striving, through the arms race, to secure for itself military superiority over the Soviet Union and the socialist world, and to conduct a policy of blackmail in relation to the socialist countries as well as the national liberation movement countries. There are quite a number of examples of this.

I would essentially characterize the United States, and all the measures that it is now undertaking in the military sphere and in the area of securing U.S. hegemonism, as a concentration of everything that aggressive imperialism brings to mankind. Everything negative that it creates for the development of the international situation and international relations, its threats to countries of the African, Latin American, and Asian Continents, all this originates from the basis of the aggressiveness of U.S. imperialism and the group, closely linked to the U.S. military and industrial complex, which has now established itself in the White House.

Of course, as the letter's author correctly notes, the antiwar movement plays a big role. The fact that these demonstrations effectively influence governments and parliaments of countries, and the social development of countries in general, is shown by the fact that special coordinating commissions have been set up within the NATO bloc that are now developing measures in accordance with U.S. plans to effectively oppose these movements, particularly the fall march.

Peace marches are now being planned in practically all countries; in Europe and the Americas, particularly in Latin America, these fall peace marches will have an enormous scope. Therefore, under no circumstances should one underestimate the fact that this movement has some impact.

Finally, there is a last point that I would like to mention. Of course, this movement cannot make its impact felt rapidly. It gathers strength and makes its impact gradually. As you know, parliaments in a number of countries, particularly in the Netherlands, have not made a decision to deploy intermediate-range missiles after all, not on Netherlands territory [sentence as heard]. This is because of the influence of public opinion; 10 deputies have voted against it; there you have impact.

Of course, peace supporters and all those who oppose nuclear weapons very attentively keep track of Soviet peace initiatives because they understand that these peace intiatives are an enormous help to all those sections who support the preservation of peace and international security. Here a decisive role is also played by the might of the Soviet Union and its military strength, which restrains the hotheads who would like to set nuclear weapons in motion.

'Psychological War'

[Zorin] Leonid Mitrofanovich, we have a whole pack of letters whose authors turn their attention to the aggravation of the ideological offensive conducted against us by political figures and propaganda centers in capitalist states. I think that Comrade Belov, a physician from Leningrad, notes correctly that this offensive is taking the form of a genuine psychological war. How do you see this state of affairs?

[Zamyatin] Valentin Sergeyevich, in studying bourgeois radio propaganda, particularly that conducted against socialist countries, we know from personal experience that together with the arms race and various kinds of economic sanctions, imperialism has literally undertaken informational and propagandist intervention against us. It has expanded on the air, in the mass media, and in Western publications. Almost every address by the U.S. President and other leading figures in the administration become specimens of what I would call cheap anticommunism. Either Reagan in his speeches stresses false maxims taken from Geobbels about Lenin's 10 commandments, or makes devil-may-care promises to cast communism into the dustbin of history, as he likes to put it now.

Our class enemy has unleashed a psychological war against the Soviet Union and the socialist countries, and President Reagan stated this at one time in Britain. These were not just words; he reinforced this with practical deeds as well. For example, I can say that the U.S. Information Agency has now substantially and materially been strengthened, as have the radios on which they lean on to conduct their diversionary and subversive work against socialist and Third World countries, and people have been moved around.

You know how mercenaries are sometimes recruited to operate in certain African countries for appropriate rewards. Often they are criminals who go there and fight African or Asian peoples. The same thing is happening now in this U.S. Information Agency and its affiliated and subordinate organs, the Voice of America, Radio Liberty, Radio Free Europe. Suddenly, in recent months, they have recruited, for appropriate sums of money of course, a great number of all kinds of turncoats who at one time or another left the Soviet Union, or people who at one time or another cooperated with Hitler's forces and worked for Goebbels' propaganda. All of them, the majority of them, now find refuge in these very propaganda organs that work against the Soviet Union.

What can one expect from these so-called information services and programs? These information programs are no longer informational; they have turned into politicized and subversive onslaughts against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, although Reagan is now camouflaging this whole policy by using such decorous expressions as "project truth" or "public diplomacy." You see, he has now come out with a public diplomacy project.

The mass media are now charged with playing the role not only of propagandists of imperialist policies, but also of direct organizers of subversive acts against socialism and of coordinating and guiding centers for counterrevolutionary forces and antisocialist elements.

[Zorin] Leonid Mitrofanovich, you also know it is indicative that all these activities are headed by people who are personally close to the current president and who are freely admitted to the White House.

[Zamyatin] Yes. This is done intentionally.

[Zorin] It is, of course, no accident.

Geneva Arms Talks

[Zorin] Another group of letters. The authors of these letters pose questions about the course of Soviet-U.S. talks conducted in Geneva and ask about the state of affairs at these talks. In this regard I would like to turn our attention to this circumstance. You know that a recess has been declared at the talks and Edward Rowny, head of the U.S. delegation at the START talks, who recently returned to Washington from Geneva, painted quite an optimistic picture of the state of affairs, making it unambiguously understood that definite progress has been made at the talks. What would you say regarding these declarations?

[Zamyatin] Valentin Sergeyevich, you know that I have repeatedly read these declarations and in the U.S. press. These declarations come not only from Rowny, but also from other U.S. representatives, particularly when one round of talks begins. They want to introduce a certain sense of well-being into these talks. However, knowing how these talks proceed, I can quite confidently say that all these declarations -- from Reagan saying that his position at these talks is flexible, to Rowny stating that everything is going favorably at the talks, does not correspond to reality. Both the talks on strategic arms and on nuclear arms in Europe were suspended in a state of impasse, and they are at an impasse because of the position of the United States. In other words, there is no actual progress at these talks.

You ask why the Americans are making these declarations? They are making them with two aims: First, to influence their allies that supposedly the United States is doing everything possible at the talks so that they will be successful. Well, if they are not successful, it is not the fault of the United States, and then there is nothing left for the United States to do but deploy their Pershings on the territory of FRG and other West European allies at the end of December this year.

On the other hand, the fact that they are actively conducting talks not only reassures their allies, but by these kinds of declarations attempts to cool the fervor of antiwar sentiments that are growing within those countries, because many people who participate in the antiwar and antimissile movement accuse the United States of the fact that the United States chose a completely clear direction for itself by adopting the dual decision a number of years ago. You remember that the dual decision, as it was adopted at the 1979 NATO session, consisted of talks and rearmament [dovooruzheniye]. So the United States chose a completely clear direction for itself -- rearmament.

[Zorin] And talks just for show.

[Zamyatin] And talks just for show, for decoration. As for us, we went to these talks with a completely definite aim -- to achieve a reduction in nuclear confrontation [protivostoyaniye] both in Europe and in the area of strategic arms. This aim of our policies remains to this day. Therefore, we are now talking about U.S. politicians looking at the remnants of these talks and at the minimal time left this year, and looking from realistic positions -- that solutions should be sought. They have not done this up to now.

U.S. Internal Situation

[Zorin] Leonid Mitrofanovich, do you think that the internal political situation in the United States influences these maneuvers of the administration?

[Zamyatin] I think it does. And this is why: The United States is approaching 1984, an election year, when each party begins to work out its platform and the position it will present to the voters.

Now, as the Republicans have begun to take account of what they have done in the first 4-year period, the fact arises that in total almost billion dollar budgets have appeared in the area of the arms race, while in the area of developing relations with other countries -- here I want to consider only Soviet and U.S. relations and limit myself to this in our program today -- here the U.S. Administration has done nothing positive. On the contrary, it has broken down everything that had been accumulated in the seventies, the years of detente.

Now the voters are faced with the question: Can they entrust another 4-year presidential term to such a government if the U.S. Administration continues the process of breakdown [lomka] and confrontation at this pace? Where will it lead events?

Now they begin to come forward with declarations that no, after all, the administration has had contacts with the Soviet Union and is holding talks, while enumerating all the countries where general international talks are being held. They even say that good contacts exist between our ambassador and minister [correcting himself] U.S. Secretary of State Shultz, and so on. But they do not talk about the fact that the essence of Soviet-U.S. relations is not being discussed there, and if it is, then many questions are not being solved. Thus a definite aim is behind the fact that declarations of the Rowny kind and others are appearing, the aim of showing that this administration can also supposedly have contacts and discuss practical questions concerning the development of relations.

[Zorin] This is clear. This is a kind of political cosmetics. Then, the next question arises: If today, proceeding from internal political and other considerations, Washington resorts to such cosmetics, from your point of view, could a situation arise in the foreseeable future where Washington will have to engage not only in cosmetics but also concretely amend its current positions?

[Zamyatin] I think that this necessity is indeed imminent, but what will be decided in the White House is another question. The White House is now under pressure from voting sections of the populations and from the opposition Democratic Party, through the latter's candidates. As you remember, currently four candidates of the Democratic Party are conducting election campaigns. They are Mondale, former vice president under Carter, Glen Hart [as heard], who headed the committee for disarmament questions; astronaut Glenn, who is now in general rapidly scoring points; and Senator Cranston, who is now coming forward with very active positions on freezing the arms race and gradually reducing nuclear arms, and is one of the creators of the platform which the Democratic Party is now advancing for the elections.

[Zorin] There is no leader yet, but from your personal point of view, who will be the most probable opponent of the Republican candidate for the elections?

[Zamyatin] I will put it this way: First of all, the Republican Party candidate has not been nominated yet. American colleagues, when you ask them this question, give this explanation: The situation now does not favor nominating Reagan. The scandal around the stolen documents has not yet abated. When it abates, somewhere around November, Reagan will put forward his candidacy for another term. That is what everyone says; they also say that the committee for electing Reagan for another presidential term has been put in operation.

I think that his opponent from the Democratic Party could be Mondale. He is known as a major politician, but it could be astronaut Glenn or another candidate still completely unknown to us. All the same, one thing is clear: Kennedy has declined to launch a pre-election struggle in 1984.

[Zorin] Leonid Mitrofanovich, there is the fact that Mondale was vice president. This of course gives him definite experience, but he was vice president under Carter. Is this to his advantage or is it a burden?

[Zamyatin] My personal opinion is that it is naturally a burden.

[Zorin] Due to the unpopularity of Carter's policies.

[Zamyatin] Carter's policies.

U.S. Latin American 'Backyard'

[Zorin] I see. Good. Now we will turn to another group of questions from the letters received recently. Their authors pose the question: What is the reason why precisely now, in the summer of 1983, Washington has created a new international crisis situation in Central America?

[Zamyatin] I think there is no reason why it should create this critical situation precisely in the summer of 1983. The situation developed gradually, because the United States hardened its position on countries in the Caribbean a number of years ago. At the same time in this region the national liberation movement in a whole series of Central American countries increased its activity sharply as did the support for these countries by other Central American countries and many other states of the world.

The United States has always considered this region to be its backyard.

One of the U.S. politicians who talked with us in the Supreme Soviet recently said that, for the United States, Latin America has always been its backyard. But when we told him that backyard or out in the back [zadvorki] sounds very bad in Russian both in a political or other sense, he said that it was probably an inexact translation. The translation is completely exact. A backyard is a place out in the back, a yard out in the back, and that is how Americans have always considered Latin America.

They decided they could freely lord over the region and install regimes suitable to themselves. After all, it is no coincidence that for decades the Latin American and Caribbean countries have been known as banana republics, tin empires, and other kinds of empires. This indicated a country's relationship with some multinational -- or, more accurately, American -- company which wrung out the country's mineral resources and held sway to such an extent that it appointed and replaced presidents, put in governments, eliminated unnecessary people, physically destroyed [fizicheski unichtozhala] politicians, and so forth.

Nicaragua has now found itself at the center of events. The United States is unhappy that a country so close to the Panama Canal Zone is following a democratic development, has its own democratic leadership, and pursues a nonaligned policy. Reagan does not like any of this. Take note: Three armadas are presently moving towards Nicaragua. One carrier group is moving from the Pacific Ocean, a second is moving towards the coast of Nicaragua from the Caribbean Sea. The number of military ships, including two aircraft carriers, totals 18 U.S. combat units. This demonstration of force is being carried out in direct proximity to the shores of Central America.

On the other hand, the Americans are also closing in on Nicaragua from the north. They are transferring their Armed Forces into Honduras and have announced 5-month maneuvers of U.S. and Honduran troops there. A total of some 5,000 troops are already there and additional Rapid Deployment Force troops are being transferred. By the way, in Asian and African countries they are now justifiably being called rapid robbery forces. These troops are being transferred and Nicaragua is being encroached on from the north.

The Nicaraguan people are struggling very staunchly for their independence and are supported in this by many Central and Latin American states and other nonaligned countries. Documents adopted at the conference of nonaligned states in Delhi, and Reagan's recent talks in Mexico with the Mexican President attest to this. The talks were practically fruitless, although only one question was on the agenda: The situation in Central America.

Mexico's position is that emerging contentious issues should not be solved by force or gunboat diplomacy but by way of talks taking national interest into consideration.

[Zorin] Leonid Mitrofanovich, do you think the latest events in Guatemala are related to this process?

[Zamyatin] I think they are directly related because the Americans were not very happy with the regime of the Republic's president. It was pro-American, but on some issues it wavered about the whole policy of U.S. force. Now they have installed a person who welcomes and promotes U.S. policy entirely.

They did not like one politician so they got rid of him with CIA help. Here you have your answer: Whether U.S. policy views this as the backyard of the United States or whether this policy is independent.

Attention To Chad

[Zorin] Now quite naturally the most recent letters to "Studio 9" are related to events in Chad. Some letter writers ask: Why has a small country such as Chad, hardly ever before mentioned in the world's press, now become an object of special attention of Washington and its NATO allies, particularly France? What is going on here?

[Zamyatin] Valentin Sergeyevich, things are as follows: If we look at a map and see where Chad is located -- this piece of desert in the center of Africa, as one American has called it -- you will see that in the east it borders on Sudan and Egypt, in the south it borders on the Central African Republic and through it with Zaire; in the west it borders on Niger, Nigeria, and Cameroon, which are in the orbit of French influence; and in the north, its longest border is with Libya.

Chad's strategic position in the center of the French African possessions, I would say, has always determined French concern with maintaining its interests there.

Now the United States, in its global posture, also appreciates Chad's strategic position. An internecine and internal struggle has been going on for 17 years in Chad because its northern part is made up of Islamic tribes while the southern part consists of -- I want to look it up here, yes -- animists as they are generally called, or various tribes which populate southern Chad. Catholic and French influence is stronger here, whereas Libyan influence is stronger in the north.

In 1979 they decided to overcome what amounted to internal contradictions, and a corresponding agreement was concluded. Libyan troops were withdrawn and the French garrison was decreased, although part of the French troops remained in the south. A transitional government was established -- that was at the beginning of 1979 -- headed by Goukouni Oueddei. Habre, who has now proclaimed himself president of Chad, was in this government.

It is known that U.S. intelligence approached Habre as early as 1981 and paid him large sums of money, and that he was a good prospect for the Americans, a figure through which U.S. influence in the region could be established.

Now he has placed himself at the head of the struggle and has effected a kind of coup in the south by proclaiming himself president. A struggle between the north and south is underway between the legitimate transitional government, the government of Goukouni Oueddei, which is recognized by the Organization of African Unity, and this self-proclaimed president who was once a French Army officer with the ties I just mentioned.

Both the Americans and the French have now intervened actively in this civil war; they have virtually internationalized this conflict and are continuing to expand it. Suffice it to say that as of today 3,000 Zairian troops in an expeditionary corps are fighting there, as are about 1,000 French troops. They are called different things: Some say they are instructors, others say this is an expeditionary corps based in the French possessions in Africa. They are, in fact, real combat units. Americans are also involved. They have flown in heavy artillery while maneuvers have begun around the perimeter of this state which borders on Libya. The maneuvers, code named "Bright Star-83," will continue for several months, with RDF troops participating. Egyptian and Sudanese troops are participating as a cover, but the participants are predominantly U.S. troops.

Again, there is a repetition of U.S. gunboat diplomacy, for another carrier group is approaching the coast of Libya from the Mediterranean Sea in order to put pressure on Libya.

A fierce propaganda campaign is being waged against Libya because the United States does not approve of the independent policy pursued by al-Qadhdhafi in this country.

[Zorin] Another question on this, Leonid Mitrofanovich: Is this U.S. interference in Chad linked with Washington's Middle East strategy in general?

[Zamyatin] It is definitely linked because U.S. strategy in the Middle East, as seen in recent years -- that is, the military alliance with Israel -- is directed against the Arab states and, above all aimed at disuniting them. This alliance in a disunited Arab world must, according to U.S. schemes, consolidate Israeli supremacy in this region and, most importantly, U.S. influence in the area.

Therefore, when U.S. propaganda is attacking Libya and its armed forces are being brought up to Libya's borders, it is pitting Libya against Egypt, and Libya against Sudan, and is attempting to disunite these countries. Of course, if we examine this entire policy then we see that the events in Chad seem to have a second side -- weakening of Arab unity and struggle against the Arab countries' united front.

Current Polish Situation

[Zorin] Thank you. Now I would like to turn to a large group of letters which ask about the situation in Poland after the repeal of martial law there. How do you, Leonid Mitrofanovich, assess the current situation and what is your opinion about the prospects for the development of political processes in that country?

[Zamyatin] I recently visited Poland and had the opportunity to satisfy myself that the general situation in Poland is stabilizing considerably. After the repeal of martial law an upsurge can now be observed in certain spheres of Polish life. I mention this because martial law provided the government of Comrade Jaruzelski an opportunity to bring order to the sphere of management and the sphere of stabilizing the economy, because those disorganizing processes which Solidarity was carrying out -- endless strikes of various forms and shapes -- all sharply affected the Polish economy.

Still affecting things at the present time is the fact that although the Polish economy has reached plan targets according to indicators for the first half-year, nevertheless in the general standard of living the levels set by the government have not yet been reached. One can feel that the people in Poland are breathing easier. When you speak with many comrades in Poland -- we had an opportunity to meet people at plants and in intellectual circles -- and ask the question "Well, how are things?" the majority of them reply: "It has become a little easier." People are enjoying the fact that they can now work calmly, work for themselves and for the state. At the same time a certain nervousness is apparent because although Solidarity has been split and has practically destroyed itself through its own activities -- by showing that it does not come out at all for the interests of the working class, but comes out against the socialist state and is a counterrevolutionary force -- Solidarity as such no longer exists. But splinters of it exist mainly with the support rendered by Western subversive centers.

Now these remnants of Solidarity want to make use of the third anniversary of the August events -- those disorders which occurred in the Gdansk region in 1980 -- in order to once again take to the streets of several cities at the end of August to show that they still have a certain strength.

I made some inquiries and even asked workers when I was in their company: What is your attitude to all this? Often the answers were something like this: Well now, if they do not take to the streets then they will not get money from the West, they will not get support.

They want to demonstrate to their masters that they can still cause some kind of hostile damage to Poland, to the Polish state, and even to their own people. This is one section. But, of course, there is another certain underground section which wages a struggle against socialist Poland.

[Zorin] Underground activity continues despite the amnesty?

[Zamyatin] It continues, and although some of the people left the underground with the amnesty, nevertheless a certain section of the people remained underground and are now seeking various kinds of cover for their antisocialist activities. They are not counting on the effect which Solidarity strives for with these demonstrations -- which is doubtful, so to speak -- and demonstrations will occur, but they no longer play a determining role. On the contrary, they are seeking various kinds of cover for a struggle on a strategic level, if you will, a gradual penetration and subversion of the government and its foundations.

This section is working among the intelligentsia, among high school seniors and college students, and a whole series of other groups. It is waging an active struggle in order to continue these processes which were imposed on Poland from outside, processes to destabilize the situation and a desire to somehow prejudice the socialist development of Poland.

The country and party are now preparing, and the work of party organizations in Poland has become more active. This is a very good sign. We saw how party aktivs are working at plants. We also asked the following question: If a Solidarity group were to arise at your plant now, could you defend your plant? You know that at many enterprises there were confident replies: Yes, we could. People are tired of these provocateurs who shout and hinder the normal development of life.

People understand that a deterioration of the general economic situation in the country stems from the fact that Solidarity undermined economic plans with strikes and other actions and that the entire improvement of these processes now depends on how enterprises will operate. Now the people are confident, but one should not overestimate those processes about which I have spoken in relation to the subversive activities in Poland. Vigilance is needed. This is what the Polish leadership is talking about.

They are now heading for a plenum of the Party Central Committee. A plenum on ideological questions will be convened soon and people in party organizations are expecting answers to many ideological questions -- How is the party to develop further? Which paths must be followed? What kind of struggle must be waged in the sphere of ideology for the purity of Marxist-Leninist theory in the party?

[Zorin] Leonid Mitrofanovich, what can you say about the position of the Polish church today?

[Zamyatin] You know, that is a complicated issue, not for me, but for Poland. Complicated because for ages the Polish Roman Catholic Church has played a definite role among the Polish people. It has its own traditions. At the same time, the Polish Roman Catholic Church was to some extent on the side of the counterrevolutionary forces during the August events.

A certain section of the clergy took and continues to take a position of struggle against socialism in Poland. Another section of the clergy, more sober-minded, understands that Poland is a socialist country and that the church must build its relations recognizing the existing realities, that is: socialism in Poland. It favors a certain cooperation with the Polish Government.

At the same time, after the Roman Catholic pope's visit to Poland, the situation became somewhat complicated.

The aggressive part of the church that comes out for a conflict with the government and the socialist state became more active. Its antisocialist sermons also became more virulent. Now the forces which come out against socialism, even if they are atheist forces, seek a union with these Roman Catholic church figures and are forming some kind of definite unified system of struggle with them, particularly using the churches in a whole range of cities and the sermons delivered in them.

I would put it this way, that if we were to weigh the pluses and minuses of Wojtyla's visit -- this is more evident to the Polish comrades, for they will analyze the situation -- but from my point of view, after the Roman Catholic pope's visit certain aggressive circles in the Polish church became considerably more active.

Iran-Iraq War

[Zorin] Leonid Mitrofanovich, we have already posed questions about the war between Iran and Iraq in discussions in Studio 9. However, as before, we receive many letters on this topic. Therefore, I would like you to briefly touch on these letters.

[Zamyatin] You know that I also received a letter in which a viewer wrote: Comrade Zamyatin, you said in the last program that two states -- Iran and Iraq -- have been fighting for the third year now over a strip of land. Is this true or are you mistaken?

Comrades, I am not mistaken. They are indeed fighting over a strip of land which was left as a legacy after the British overlordship in this region. As the British colonialists often did when borders were being established, they left a certain strip of land here which could be disputed by either side and played on these contradictions. Such a delayed-action mine was laid in this region during British colonial rule. Later, in 1975, a treaty between Iran and Iraq, concluded in Algiers, to a certain extent settled these border disputes in the Shatt Al-'Arab River Basin. This area of about a few hundred kilometers found certain juridical confirmation as the official border, or rather as the route of the official border.

However, later Iraq accused Iran of not fulfilling the conditions of the treaty. Iran objected and war has continued for 3 years, since September 1980. Although it may seem as though it is on a small scale, official sources indicate that this conflict has already brought enormous hardship to the peoples of Iraq and Iran: 200,000 have been killed; more than 300,000 have been wounded and taken prisoner; and many cities have been destroyed, particularly near oil fields, and the production of oil by these states and its sale on the world markets has been sharply reduced. For example, income from the sale of Iranian oil has decreased by 75 percent in 3 years.

Direct benefit from this conflict is of course derived by the United States, which is interested in these two countries -- which occupy anti-imperialist and anti-American positions on many international issues -- bleeding each other dry. I would like to stress that the United States is using this war as grounds for building up its military presence in the Persian Gulf.

[Zorin] Leonid Mitrofanovich, the events have gone on for a long time now, but what are the prospects from your point of view?

[Zamyatin] You know that many states and many organizations, including the organization of Arab countries, have more than once mediated between Iran and Iraq, or rather have attempted to do so. None of the missions were successful. The contradictions here are very acute; the conflict is not merely a territorial conflict, it is a political one, and one that is connected with religion. On one side there are Shi'ites, on the other Sunnis, and the acuteness of the conflict has been aggravated by the religious factor.

[Zorin] Everyone knows that the United States had very important military facilities on Iranian territory during the bloody dictatorship of the Iranian shah. The Americans had to remove these facilities after the shah's regime collapsed, and there were reports in the Western press that Turkey was among the countries to which these facilities were transferred. Leonid Mitrofanovich, is this so?

[Zamyatin] Yes, there were such reports in the press, but they were not corroborated. They were also refuted by official Turkish circles. However, in this regard the following kinds of reports occasionally appear: Specifically, the Americans recently held NATO maneuvers near the Turkish-Soviet border, with simulated landings of NATO forces, the use of Turkish air bases, and the transfer of certain weapons to this region. Luns, NATO secretary general, and Rogers, commander of this bloc's armed forces, were present at the maneuvers and openly asserted that the main danger to Turkey's sovereignty and national independence comes from the Soviet Union.

The aim of such fabrications is completely clear: to force Turkey to spend more on weapons, to follow the U.S. line, and to attempt to undermine the development of good-neighbor relations between Turkey and the Soviet Union. I think that generally the attempts that they resort to... these assertions are false, because there is, of course, no threat to Turkey from the Soviet Union.

These absurd accusations directed at us are in obvious contradiction to the practice of mutual relations that exists between our two countries, and which both we and the Turkish side are striving to develop in the spirit of good-neighborliness. In particular, this is indicated by the recent visit to the Soviet Union by Mr Ulusu, prime minister of Turkey, and Foreign Minister Turkmen, who met and talked with Soviet leaders. Both sides noted the positive direction of the development of relations between our countries and confirmed the striving for the further development of these relations.

Nuclear Restraint Pledge

One other letter. It was written by Vasiliy Ivanovich Tolstykh, an engineer and a veteran of the Patriotic War, from Dnepropetrovsk. I must say that this question is also posed in one way or another by a number of our other television viewers.

Comrade Tolstykh writes to express concern over whether the situation of 1941 could be repeated under new, present conditions, particularly regarding the fact that Washington has not taken upon itself the pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, while the Soviet Union did make this pledge.

[Zamyatin] Valentin Sergeyevich, I understand this question thus: The question here is not only whether the Soviet Union made a pledge or not, but the question is broader -- would it damage our security if the Soviet Union made such a pledge?

[Zorin] Precisely so.

[Zagladin] Yes, comrades, we indeed took upon ourselves a unilateral and voluntary pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, and we proceed from our military conception that the Soviet Union does not intend to use these weapons first.

However, these weapons are indeed rapidly acting and destructive, and it seems that the comrade who wrote this letter primarily turned his attention to this factor -- that we are not using nuclear weapons first, but the enemy will use them, the destruction may be great, and damage may be caused to the country. Does not this decrease our military commitments and military capabilities? No, it does not.

Our retaliatory nuclear missile assets are so powerful and can be so rapidly activated [zadeystvony] that the enemy would immediately, literally in minutes, feel all the consequences if he ventured to be the first to use nuclear weapons against us. This is not to deter our enemy, this is an actual fact associated with our military and political concepts.

When we introduced this proposal, we proceeded from the fact that if the Soviet Union took upon itself the pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons, and if those who possess these weapons also took this unilateral pledge, there would be neither a first nor second nuclear strike, and this decreases the danger and possibility of the beginning of nuclear war.

As regards our might, here I would like to cite for you comrades the words of Yuriy Vladmirovich Andropov. I would like to recall what he said in this regard in one of his recent interviews. He said that the U.S. Administration needs to remember that questions of war and peace cannot be treated so lightly. All attempts to achieve military superiority over the Soviet Union are futile. The Soviet Union will never permit this and will never find itself unarmed in the face of any threat. Let Washington firmly digest this. It is time they stopped inventing newer and newer variants of the best way to unleash nuclear war in hopes of winning it. This pursuit is not only irresponsible, but reckless.

These words of the head of our party and state very succinctly summarize our approach to questions of war and peace, and our military policies. We are sufficiently armed to return a strike by the enemy, but the essence of our policies is not to permit nuclear war.

Comrades, you know that 17 years are left until we enter a new millenium.

[Zorin] Not just a new century, but a new millenium.

[Zagladin] A new millenium, and the aim of our policies, the policies of our party and our state, is to preserve everything that human civilization has created, to enter a new age without nuclear weapons and nuclear confrontation, and to bring with us to the new age everything good that mankind has created in this millenium.

[Zorin] Thank you. Well, our time on the air has elapsed. It remains for me to thank Leonid Mitrofanovich for his answers to our television viewers' questions, to thank our television viewers for their attention, and until our next meeting here in our Studio 9, thank you.

U.S. ACTIONS ON BEREZHKOV AFFAIR CALLED 'INHUMAN'

LD191615 Moscow TASS in English 1539 GMT 19 Aug 83

[Text] Moscow August 19 TASS -- The Foreign Affairs Ministry of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, on instructions from the Soviet Government, makes the following statenemt to the Embassy of the United States of America.

The Government of the United States of America, represented by the Department of Justice and the State Department of the United States, has grossly violated its own commitments under the Vienna convention on diplomatic relations by its actions as regards the family of Soviet diplomat, first secretary of the USSR Embassy in Washington V.M. Berezhkov.

In accordance with this convention, staff members of diplomatic missions and members of their families are outside jurisdiction, including administrative, of the state of residence.

Meanwhile, the U.S. Department of Justice has issued, and the U.S. State Department and other American agencies actively fulfilled, an unprecedented order banning V.M. Berezhkov's son, schoolboy Andrey Berezhkov, from leaving the United States under the pretext that the American authorities had to make sure whether he wanted to stay for ever in the United States.

To say nothing of the disgraceful inhuman character of such actions, the references to some American domestic laws and rules, contained in the above-mentioned order of the U.S. Justice Department, are totally groundless, since there exists a norm, generally accepted in the civilised world, on unconditional primacy of international commitments of a state over its domestic legislation.

By the way, the U.S. Constitution directly states that all international treaties, concluded by the United States, "shall be the supreme law of the land." Thus, the U.S. authorities have violated in this case their own Constitution as well.

U.S. officials are keen on prattling about human rights and reading lectures to others on this subject. But the true worth of this prattling was vividly revealed in this instance, when the rights of a concrete individual, clearly formulated in a concrete document, signed by the United States, were violated with utter impudence.

This is far from being the only instance of such brazen actions by the American authorities are regards, specifically, Soviet citizens, including children.

The drama of the family of the Soviet citizens Polovchaks, who visited the United States at the invitation of their relations, has continued for three years already. Their minor son, forcibly taken away from his parents, has not as yet returned home.

Not long ago American services made an open attempt to dissuade a 15-year-old son of Soviet journalist V.G. Kukharenko, officially accredited to the United States, from returning to the USSR.

That was followed by another brazen provocation -- this time as regards the Soviet diplomat's son.

The fact that the American authorities finally were compelled in the two latter instances to abandon the attempts to keep the Soviet children in the United States in no way changes the above-said political and legal qualification of their actions.

Moreover, these individual cases have vividly reflected the general line, which has been becoming increasingly more apparent in the U.S. policy, towards ignoring written and unwritten, but sanctified by centuries-old traditions, norms of international intercourse, the line towards renouncing treaties and agreements signed by the United States or their actual non-observance.

Stating its protest to the U.S. Government against the provocations and arbitrariness committed by the American authorities in respect to Soviet citizens, the Soviet Government insists that an end be put to these unlawful actions. It warns in the most serious way that those who resort to violation of international commitments as regards others, should not think that other standards will be applied to them, and that they will not experience in full measure consequences of lawlessness they perpetrate.

U.S. MEDIA CITED ON ANDROPOV-WINPISINGER TALKS

PM191058 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Aug 83 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "The Prime Task Is To Defend Peace: U.S. Mass Media on Yu.V. Andropov's Talk With U.S. Labor Union Figure"]

[Text] Washington, 18 Aug (TASS) -- The talks between Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the prominent U.S. labor union figure W. Winpisinger, who has been in the USSR at the head of a labor union delegation, have attracted the close attention of the U.S. media. In their detailed exposition of and commentary on the Soviet leader's statements, the press, television, and news agencies stress the USSR's unswerving desire for peace and to achieve a just agreement with the United States with a view to curbing the nuclear arms race and averting the threat of a new world war. They also note the USSR's readiness to develop ties and friendly contracts between the working people of both countries. The commentaries point out that the Soviet Union, as Yu.V. Andropov stressed, considers it its foremost task to try to avert a dangerous development of events and to reinforce peace.

THE WASHINGTON POST publishes its report on the talks under the headline: "Andropov Calls For U.S. Felxibility at Geneva Talks." The Soviet Leader, the paper notes, expressed the hope that the USSR and the United States will be able to reach agreement in Geneva on nuclear arms limitation in Europe. The race in these arms, the Soviet Union's leader pointed out, is now the sore point in international relations and may become the source of a rapid and sharp increase in the threat of a new world war. Accusing Washington of aggravating the present situation by its irresponsible and aggressive political declarations and actions, Yu.V. Andropov emphasized that the USSR favors a reduction in nuclear arsenals and the achievement of an honest agreement in Geneva. He indicated that unilateral disarmament cannot be demanded of the USSR and the Soviet Union will never do this.

"Yu.V. Andropov," another American paper, THE NEW YORK TIMES, writes, "stressed that the Soviet Union will continue to adhere to a constructive and flexible line at the Geneva talks on intermediate-range nuclear missiles, which resume next month." CBS TV notes: "The Soviet leader declared that if the United States begins deploying its new nuclear missiles in Western Europe, the Soviet Union will be forced to take defensive countermeasures to safeguard its own security and the security of its allies."

UPI notes that Yu V. Andropov expressed a positive attitude toward contacts between the working people of both countries and between Soviet and U.S. trade unions, but criticized the AFL-CIO leadership and the U.S. authorities for obstructing such contacts. Another news agency -- AP -- writes that the Soviet leader stressed that he regards the presentation to him of a friendly address from American workers as a manifestation of the desire of U.S. working people to develop friendship with Soviet people and to reinforce relations of peace and cooperation between the two countries, thereby also reinforcing universal peace. The agency quotes Yu V. Andropov's remark that if a hand of friendship is extended to us, it will always be sincerely clasped by the Soviet people.

WEINBERGER'S REMARKS AT PRESS CONFERENCE DECRIED

LD191418 Moscow TASS in English 1323 GMT 19 Aug 83

[Text] Washington August 19 TASS -- The United States intends to continue the dangerous course at the build up of the nuclear arms race and the aggravation of the international situation. This was confirmed again by U.S. Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger.

Speaking at a press conference in the Pentagon, he said that the United States is speeding up the preparation for the deployment of "Pershing-2" nuclear missiles on the FRG territory at the end of the current year. Trying to justify the adventuristic intentions of the Reagan administration to achieve military supremacy over the USSR, Weinberger asserted that deployment of new U.S. nuclear weapons in Western Europe has, allegedly, the aim to "balance the correlation of forces". He said that the new missiles would not be deployed had the Soviet Union agreed to the "zero option" which had earlier been advanced by President Reagan.

This proposal aimed at disrupting the military balance, as is known, envisages unilateral reduction by the Soviet Union of its medium-range missiles while it does not affect nuclear weapon systems that the United States and NATO have in Europe now.

Weinberger's speech reflected again Washington's hegemonistic aspirations, its claims to world supremacy. It followed from the statements of the Pentagons' chief that the White House intends to continue increasing military expenditures and to build up the United States military presence in various areas of the world.

'REPENTANT' REPIN DISCUSSES ESPIONAGE CASE

LD181234 Moscow TASS in English 1220 GMT 18 Aug 83

["Valeriy Repin's Repentance" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow August 18 TASS -- "My case is both tragic and instructive. It offers a patent example of how the foreign propaganda bodies and the foreign intelligence services linked with them set up the snares, set up them cunningly, and, I would say, subtly. And still their haul is not large. But I myself was among those who fell into that snare." Valeriy Repin told a TASS correspondent. The former distributor of the so-called "Solzhenitsyn fund" in Leningrad was charged in May with high treason and anti-state activity. Repin was sentenced to two years of imprisonment with the subsequent internal exile for three years.

The TASS correspondent met him in a colony of rigorous regime where Repin is serving his term of imprisonment.

"I was fulfilling the assignments not simply of my 'dissident' friends," Repin said. "The contacts led to the U.S. General Consulate in Leningrad and thence further, beyond the ocean."

It is from beyond the ocean, through governess of the U.S. General Consulate, a certain E. Wood and trainee of the Russian language course of Leningrad State University, American D. Turnbull, that Repin received the so-called "questionnaire," a sort of instruction on how to collect intelligence information about the USSR.

"From the end of 1980 till May 1981 I turned over to American citizens E. Wood, D. Turnbull and D. Soor ten so-called 'information letters' containing classified information, to be sent subsequently via the United States General Consulate in Leningrad," Repin said.

"Are you interested to know to whom I was supplying material aid from the 'fund'? First of all I shall name M. Kazachkov. This traitor found employment in a research institute to obtain information which he would later be able to sell profitably to the CIA."

Among the persons who were given aid were G. Selivonik who was sentenced for an attempted hijacking of a plane, L. Lubman, a traitor who tried to send abroad a voluminous 'work' which he named as 'impromtu writing for the department of Mr Turner, CIA'. The United States must hasten to destroy the USSR by using any means at the disposal of civilization, he wrote. On 248 pages Lubman revealed the information constituting military secrets, was making recommendations for intensifying the subversive work against the USSR through espionage, terror, subversion and radio propaganda."

"I am satisfied with the hearing and I would like to express the gratitude to the panel of judges, the procurator, for my lawyer for the objective consideration of my case," Repin said. "I am young, I am strong enough and, the main thing, I wish to become a full-fledged citizen of my country, to serve society by my work as much as I can. Please believe me that my admission, my actions after I had been arrested were motivated not by the wish to lessen the duration of my imprisonment, not by the striving to belittle my guilt. I wish my fate to serve as a lesson to those who are influenced by all sort of Western voices and other means of propaganda hostile to us," Valeriy Repin said in conclusion.

U.S. SENATORS CONFER WITH USSR PEACE COMMITTEE

PM221103 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 21 Aug 83 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Meeting With U.S. Delegation"]

[Text] A meeting has been held at the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace with U.S. Senators C. Pell, R. Long, P. Sarbanes, D. Bumpers, J. Sasser, D. Riegle, H. Metzenbaum, and D. DeConcini, who are in the Soviet Union at the USSR Parliamentary Group's invitation.

The visitors were acquainted with the activities of Soviet peace supporters. Yu. Zhukov, chairman of the Soviet Committee for the Defense of Peace, deputy chairmen academician Ye. Primakov, V. Zhurkin and A. Masenich, and other prominent public figures replied in detail to the senator's questions on the nature of the peace movement in the USSR, stressed the Soviet public's unanimous support for the Soviet state's peace-loving foreign policy, and spoke about Soviet peace supporters' active participation in the people's worldwide struggle to avert the growing threat of nuclear war.

PRC WOMEN'S VOLLEYBALL TEAM WELCOMED TO USSR

OW220937 Moscow in Mandarin to China 1600 GMT 21 Aug 83

[From "Program for Chinese Youths"]

[Excerpt] The PRC women's volleyball team arrived in Moscow on 20 August at the invitation of the USSR Committee for Physical Culture and Sports. The team, which is the 1982 world champion, will have four friendly matches with their Soviet counterparts. Two matches will be held in Kiev, capital of the Ukranian Republic, on 22 and 23 August; two other matches will be held in Moscow on 25 and 26 August.

Present at the Moscow Sheremetyevo Airport to welcome the Chinese sports delegation were Torshlov, chairman of the Soviet Volleyball Association; Pilyayev, member of the USSR Committee for Physical Culture and Sports and a volleyball coach; and representatives of the USSR Committee for Physical Culture and Sports.

Torshlov gave a speech to welcome the Chinese volleyball team.

[Begin Torshlov recording in Russian fading into superimposed translation] On behalf of the Soviet volleyball association, let me extend my warmest welcome to the Chinese women's volleyball team. We wish you victory, full manifestation of your great skills during the matches, an enjoyable trip in our country, and a better understanding of the life of the Soviet people. [end recording]

Torshlov continued to say that he was satisfied with the resumption of Soviet-Chinese sports relations, and hoped that such relations would be further broadened so that Soviet-Chinese friendship and mutual understanding can be strengthened.

After the welcoming ceremony, this station's reporter interviewed Yuan Weimin, coach of the Chinese women's volleyball team. Yuan Weimin said: [begin recording] This is the first visit to the Soviet Union in many years by the Chinese women's volleyball team. We were here about 7 or 8 years ago to take part in an international tournament. Everyone is very happy to visit the USSR; we are also very happy that we are going to have friendly matches with the prestigious Soviet teams. We hope that in these matches we can learn from each other, promote friendship, improve skills and tactics, and make even greater contributions to the improvement of the skills of the two countries' volleyball players. We also hope that this visit will promote the two countries' sports exchange -- particularly exchanges of volleyball teams -- and (?renew) our friendship with the Soviet people. [end recording]

This station's reporter then asked Yuan Weimin to give a brief introduction of the Chinese women's volleyball team. He said:

[Begin recording] The Chinese women's volleyball team won the world title during the World Cup tournament in Japan in 1981, and also the world title in the world championships held in Peru last year. Following last year's tournament, however, the Chinese team has been reorganized. Some veteran players retired and were replaced by some new players. So our visit to the USSR this time is a training tour. We hope that, with more training, we can perform well during next year's Olympic Games. Our team is still young and has many weaknesses. For this reason, we should learn from the Soviet women's volleyball teams in many ways. [end recording]

JAPAN SEEN LINKED TO NATO MILITARY ALLIANCE

LD201646 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 20 Aug 83

[From the "I Serve the Soviet Union" program; commentary by Dr Phil Professor Lieutenant General Dmitriy Antonovich Volkogonov]

[Text] It is well known that in recent years the NATO countries, following obediently behind the United States, have done very much to aggravate the international situation to the extreme. Judge for yourself: Virtually all the peaceful and constructive proposals made by the USSR and the other socialist countries have been ignored or remained without reply. Apart from that, Washington has begun implementing an extensive and long-term program for increasing its military might. There is accelerated preparation of MX missiles, Pershing II's. Preparations are underway for production of the new Midgetman first-strike missiles. The new stealth bomber is being developed; a modification of the oil atomic submarine is being modernized; the number of neutron bombs being stored is increasing as is also the number of binary chemical charges; laser weapons and space systems are being tested. The conveyer of death is accelerating.

All of this is being done with the aim of achieving unilateral military superiority over socialism and to dictate its will to socialism.

Recently we have been able to see with increasing clarity yet another element of the global strategy of U.S. imperialism in these efforts by the militarists. It is a question of the striving to attach Japan to NATO as strongly as possible. NATO is an aggressive military alliance which does not conceal its expansionist plans. It must be said that the present Japanese leadership with Prime Minister Nakasone at its head has, as they say, an understanding attitude to this dangerous striving. His recent words and specific deeds tell of an evolution with regard to this which is dangerous for Japan and the world.

First, the Japanese leadership is in virtually total solidarity with Washington's global pretentions. At the Williamsburg meeting of the leaders of the major capital states, Nakasone virtually promised to turn Japan into an unsinkable aircraft carrier in the interests of NATO. Second, Tokyo is not only talking about stepping up its military might, it is taking action. In the past financial year alone military expenditure rose by 7.7 percent. This year it will increase by the same amount. This is the start of implementing a 5-year plan for 1983-87 during which Japan is to become one of the militarily powerful states. Over the 5 years, it is planned to spend more than 16 trillion yen on increasing armaments. This will go on new surface vessels, submarines, aircraft, tanks and other military equipment. Third, Tokyo does not publically say so, but it is known there that the United States, in its striving to achieve superiority over socialism, will not stop at aiming its medium-range nuclear weapons at the USSR only from West Europe; it will also aim them from East Asia. In the Pentagon's directives this possibility is not only envisaged but also planned and is being prepared for. And the Japanese leadership is not likely to oppose it.

Washington is doing everything to attach Japan very closely to the implementation of its expansionist plans. The present leadership of Japan is going some way to meet this dangerous course.

All this shows that the profuse talk by responsible U.S. leaders about their adherence to peace is no more than words. Under the smokescreen of peacemaking rhetoric extensive military preparations are under way today, not only in West Europe but also in East Asia where everything is being done to create a powerful strongpoint of imperialist aggression. It is not only a question of plans and intentions but of specific deeds. There are many facts; let me cite just a few.

In July this year the week-long maneuvers by the strategic nuclear forces of the United States under the code name "Global Shield-83" ended. For the first time the Japanese armed forces were directly involved in these exercises. While the United States was putting hundreds of strategic bombers with nuclear bombs into the air and preparing tens of strategic missiles for launching, the Japanese armed forces -- the so-called Self-Defense Forces -- solved problems connected with blocking sea straits and supporting the aggressive actions of the U.S. military. Japan which is not formally a member of NATO was in fact acting as an ally in these provocative large-scale exercises.

A new emphasis has been set forth recently in Japanese propaganda. The military department of the land of the rising sun has been carrying out an intense manipulation of the country's public opinion, stating that the most active participation in implementing the United States' strategy will allow Japanese security to be maintained.

There is no end to the provocative fuss about the claims to Soviet islands. Recently, Tanikawa, head of Japan's national defense, as Japanese papers reported, carried out an inspection with the aid of field glasses of the southern part of the Kuriles ridge which is Soviet territory. All of this is done in order to whip up anti-Soviet moods in Japan, to poison the international atmosphere with new provocations, to more vigorously prepare Japanese consciousness for the fact that they are all members of the crew of the unsinkable aircraft carrier sailing in the wake of the U.S. naval vessel.

The USSR cannot look on with indifference at the events which are developing. In order to ensure our security and the security of our friends, Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov stressed at the June Plenum of our party: We shall raise the combat might of the Armed Forces of the USSR which is a mighty factor in restraining the aggressive striving of imperialist reaction. Not a single challenge threatening our security can remain without response.

JAPANESE PAPER CITED ON DEFENSE TALKS WITH U.S.

LD220919 Moscow TASS in English 0900 GMT 22 Aug 83

[Text] Tokyo August 22 TASS -- The Japanese Government should follow an independent policy in its relations with the United States, which meets Japan's national interests, the influential bourgeois newspaper MAINICHI writes today.

Commenting editorially on the Japanese-American "military consultations" which start in Washington today between head of the Japan Defence Agency Kazuo Tanikawa and U.S. Defence Secretary Caspar Weinberget, MAINICHI writes: The United States has sharply intensified pressure on Japan of late, demanding that it step up its military preparations. The Pentagon claims that Japan does not undertake sufficient efforts in the military sphere and does not fulfil its pledges to defend sea lanes.

The newspaper points out that the United States, at the consultations which open today, will undoubtedly repeat its claims to the drumbeat of declarations about the "mounting Soviet threat."

We have repeatedly warned, the newspaper points out, that Japan's course towards greater cooperation with the United States in the field of defence only heightens tensions in the Far East and undermines Japan's security. That is why Japan, at the talks with Washington, should clearly state that it does not share the Pentagon's view on the Soviet threat in the Far East. Japan should clearly underline its different attitude to the Soviet Union and adopt an unequivocal independent position at the talks with the United States.

JAPANESE WHITE PAPER CRITICIZES U.S. POLICY

LD192038 Moscow TASS in English 1830 GMT 19 Aug 83

[Text] Tokyo August 19 TASS -- The Japanese Government has today accused the Reagan administration of pursuing a selfish financial and economic policy sharpening the crisis in the West and increasing the instability of the monetary system of the developed capitalist states.

This criticism against the Washington administration is contained in the white paper on the economy for 1982, which was endorsed today by the Yasuhiro Nakasone government.

The government paper says that the imposition by the USA of excessive bank rates has resulted in a sharp drop in the rate of the yen and the currencies of the other developed countries, undermined the trend in those countries towards an end to the present economic crisis.

This factor, the document says, is a serious obstacle also for ending the longest in the post-war times depression in Japan's economy.

Stagnation is also continuing in such key branches of Japan's economy as the shipbuilding, machine building, metallurgical and other industries. Unemployment is on a rise. According to the white paper, there had been by 100 thousand more jobless by the end of 1982 than at the same time in 1981. In the middle of this year the number of people who lost their jobs increased by another 300 thousand to reach now 1.7 million, which is one of the highest indicators in the post-war years.

The authors of the "white paper" are also concerned over the growing protectionist tendencies against the Japanese goods in the USA and the West European countries. Recently trade and economic differences between Japan and the USA as well as the other West European countries have become extremely strained because of the enormous deficit of these countries in trade with Japan. The "white paper" points out the need for expanding Japanese imports from those countries a more open Japanese market. [sentence as received] But no specific measures are proposed in that direction.

JAPAN DOCUMENT ON REVISING NON-NUCLEAR PRINCIPLES

LD212130 Moscow TASS in English 2000 GMT 21 Aug 83

[Text] Tokyo August 21 TASS -- A team of top military experts of the Japanese National Defence Agency with the active participation of leaders of the ruling Liberal Democratic Party have drawn up for Prime Minister Nakasone a memorandum on the need to revise the three non-nuclear principles sealed by a parliamentary resolution, namely, not to possess, not to produce and not to introduce in the country's territory nuclear weapons. The memorandum also urges renunciation of Japan's principle under which military spending must not exceed one percent of the value of the gross national product. The prime minister is requested to replace the three nuclear principles with "two and a half" and to allow U.S. warships to call at Japanese ports with nuclear weapons aboard.

Commenting on that document, the press draws attention to the importance of its appearance at a time when the policy of the incumbent conservative government has begun to display a marked militarist tilt and when a course of enhancing Japan's military role in the Far East and of its active participation in U.S. nuclear strategy is being pursued.

U.S.-JAPANESE AIR FORCE EXERCISES BEGIN

LD220616 Moscow TASS in English 1007 GMT 22 Aug 83

[Text] Tokyo August 22 TASS -- Joint Japanese-U.S. Air Force exercises have started today in Komatsu Air Base (Ishikawa Prefecture). Taking part in the exercises from both sides are 24 aircraft, including American "F-15" fighter aircraft and "E-3A" planes equipped with the early warning and control system. The exercises, which are to last till August 25, were met with indignation by the local citizens. In answer to the call of trade unions and other democratic organizations of the prefecture they held near the base a demonstration of protest against the fresh militaristic venture of the Pentagon and the Japanese Defense Agency.

DPRK ENVOY TO USSR SPEAKS AT MOSCOW SOIREE

SK220238 Moscow in Korean to Korea 1130 GMT 21 Aug 83

[From the Program "Weekly Roundup of Soviet Life"]

[Text] Last week, the Soviet people, along with the fraternal Korean people, celebrated the 38th anniversary of the Korean liberation from the colonial rule of the Japanese imperialists. On this meaningful occasion, a soiree was held at the House of Friendship in the outskirts of Moscow.

Present at the soiree were representatives of the social circles of the capital, activists of the Soviet-Korea Friendship Society, Comrade Kwon Hui-kyong, DPRK ambassador in Moscow, and staffers of the DPRK Embassy.

In his opening speech, Comrade Lebedev, vice chairman of the Central Committee of the Soviet-Korea Friendship Society and retired general said: [begin recording in Russian fading into superimposed translation] On the occasion of the national day of the Korean people, I extend warm congratulations to the Korean friends in the name of the Central Committee of the Soviet-Korea Friendship Society and the activists of the Society and greet the fraternal Korean working people.

By the annihilation of the Japanese Kanto Army in Manchuria and Korea by the Soviet Army, the colonial system of the foreign aggressors under which the Korean people had been placed for a long period of time ended and a favorable condition for building a new society in the northern half of Korea was provided.[end recording]

Comrade Lebedev, who carried out combat missions against the Japanese militarist forces in North Korea as a member of the Far East Military Committee of the 25th Soviet Army, recalled heroic events which occurred in August 1945 and spoke about the exploits of the Soviet Army which fought for the Korean people's freedom and independence.

In conclusion, Comrade Lebedev sincerely wished the DPRK workers new success in their socialist construction and in the struggle to achieve national reunification, the aspiration of the Korean people.

The DPRK ambassador to the USSR, Comrade Kwon Hui-kyong spoke at the soiree. [begin recording in Korean] Dear comrades: Today our people are significantly greeting the 38th anniversary of the Korean liberation from the colonial rule of the Japanese imperialists.

I would like to express my deep thanks to the comrades of the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries, Standing Committee of the Liaison for [word indistinct] and the Central Committee of the Soviet-Korea Friendship Society for hosting this soiree marking the 38th anniversary of the Korean liberation and for inviting us to this event.

Our people appreciate the exploits achieved by the heroic Soviet Army in the struggle to annihilate the Japanese imperialists and to liberate our fatherland.

Our party and the government of the republic always treasure the friendly relations with the fraternal Soviet party and people. These relations are being further (?consolidated) in the struggle against the imperialists and for the common cause of socialism and communism.

The friendship and cooperation between the Korean and Soviet peoples are developing with each passing day through the struggle to check and frustrate the (?war provocation) maneuvers by the imperialists led by the U.S. imperialists and to achieve peace in Asia and in the world.

Today the Soviet people are vigorously carrying out the struggle to fulfill the programmatic tasks put forward by the 26th Party Congress and the decisions of the party Central Committee in 1982 and [word indistinct] under the leadership of the CPSU headed by Comrade Yuriy Valdimirovich Andropov and are effecting great successes.

Our people sincerely rejoice over all the successes attained by the Soviet people and wish them new success in their struggle to build a developed socialist society and to win a communist victory.

We express our support for and solidarity with the efforts of the Soviet party, government, and people to relax tension created in the international arena by expansion of arms and war provocation maneuvers of the imperialists including the U.S. imperialists and to safeguard peace and security in Europe and in the World.

Our people will make all efforts to develop the friendly relations and cooperation between our two parties, two nations, and two peoples based on Marxism-Lenism and proletariat internationalism.

In conclusion, I wish the Soviet people a greater success in their struggle to implement the tasks put forward by the 26th CPSU Congress.

Long live the militant friendship and unity between the Korean and Soviet people! [applause] [end recording]

AFGHANISTAN CELEBRATES INDEPENDENCE ANNIVERSARY

Soviet State, Party Greetings

PM191328 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Aug 83 First Edition p 1

[Text] To Comrade Babrak Karmal, general secretary of the PDPA Central Committee and chairman of the DRA Revolutionary Council

To Comrade Soltan 'Ali Keshtmand, chairman of the DRA Council of Ministers

On the occasion of the DRA National Day -- the Day of the Restoration of Independence -- we send cordial fraternal congratulations to the PDPA Central Committee, the Revolutionary Council, the DRA Government, the entire Afghan people, and you personally, dear comrades.

The victory won by the Afghan people 64 years ago in sustained battles against foreign colonists created the preconditons for the Afghan state's development along the path of strengthening its independence and sovereignty and boosted the struggle waged by other Asian peoples for liberation from the fetters of colonial bondage.

In the first few days following the emergence of independent Afghanistan, the young Soviet Russia announced its recognition of and established relations based on friendship and equality with Afghanistan and took practical steps to render assistance to the neighboring country's people.

For its part, Afghanistan was the first state to announce its official recognition of the Soviet republic. In the subsequent years the relations between the Soviet Union and Afghanistan have developed fruitfully in the interests of the peoples of both countries on the basis of the principles of good-neighborliness, equality, noninterference in internal affairs, and respect for national independence and territorial integrity.

The revolution carried out by the Afghan people under the leadership of their vanguard -- the PDPA -- in April 1978 marked the beginning of a new chapter in the history of friendly Soviet-Afghan relations. Imbued with a spirit of fraternity and revolutionary solidarity, these relations are developing dynamically in the most varied spheres in the interests of the peoples of both countries and the cause of peace, democracy, and social progress.

We wish the Afghan people further successes in the struggle against the continuing intrigues by the forces of imperialism and reaction and in implementing the April Revolution's task in creating a new, flourishing Afghanistan.

CPSU Central Committee

USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium

USSR Council of Ministers

DRA Leaders' Telegram

LD181947 Moscow TASS in English 1712 GMT 18 Aug 83

[Text] Moscow August 18 TASS -- "The Afghan people will always remember that the young Soviet republic led by great Lenin was the first to recognize Afghanistan's independence and extend the hand of friendship to the Afghan people.

The principles of good-neighbourliness, equality, mutual respect for national sovereignty and territorial integrity, mutually beneficial cooperation make the solid unshakeable foundation of relations between our countries and peoples".

This is pointed out in the telegram addressed to the Soviet leaders by the leaders of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan Babrak Karmal and Soltan Ali Keshtmand. The telegram expresses gratitude for the congratulations on the occasion of the national holiday of Afghanistan -- the day of restoration of independence.

"After the April Revolution of 1978 in Afghanistan," the telegram continues, "the relations between the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics have raised to a new even higher stage and have become those of true fraternal friendship and internationalist solidarity. New opportunities have opened up for even wider all-round cooperation in the political, economic and cultural fields. The Soviet Union's disinterested aid to the peoples of Afghanistan in the difficult days of struggle against imperialist intervention is a vivid example of internationalism in action."

Karmal on Anniversary

LD192034 Moscow TASS in English 1810 GMT 19 Aug 83

[Text] Kabul August 19 TASS -- The Afghan people are celebrating today their national holiday -- the 64th anniversary of restoration of independence. Babrak Karmal, general secretary of the Central Committee of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, chairman of the Revolutionary Council of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, has addressed a message to the people on the occasion of that red-letter day. He pointed out the great significance of the victory scored by the Afghan people over British imperialism in 1919. The people of Afghanistan, who raised the banner of independence and freedom, received fraternal assistance from the young Soviet republic, led by V.I. Lenin, the great friend of the Afghan people and all peoples of the East. The relations established between the two countries have become a striking example of friendship of a new type between peoples, states and nations.

The Afghan leader pointed out the guiding role of the People's Democratic Party in the struggle in Afghanistan against exploitation and oppression. The party succeeded in bringing the working people to the victory of the April Revolution.

Babrak Karmal condemned the undeclared war unleashed against democratic Afghanistan by the forces of international reaction and U.S. imperialism. As a result of the war, peaceful citizens are killed and damage is inflicted upon the national economy. But the Afghan people are courageously defending freedom and the gains of the April Revolution. They are not alone in this struggle. One their side is the entire progressive mankind with the great Soviet Union at their head, which is a powerful buttress of peace and social progress. There is a real possibility of a settlement of the situation around Afghanistan in the peaceful proposals of the DRA's Government of May 14, 1980 and August 24, 1981. We have repeatedly declared and reiterate again that all the outstanding problems should be resolved at the table of direct negotiations. In this direction the Afghan Government has already repeatedly expressed its determination and the necessary goodwill, Babrak Karmal stressed.

Tourching upon foreign-policy issues, the Afghan leader stressed that being a peaceable and non-aligned country, the DRA firmly adheres to an active policy directed at strengthening peace and developing international cooperation.

The DRA will further play a positive role in the struggle for peace and international security, against imperialism and war. We hold that friendly and fraternal relations, revolutionary solidarity with the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, with all the progressive forces of the world accord with the vital interests of the Afghan people. Today the republic maintains diplomatic relations with more than 70 countries.

Babrak Karmal touched upon the successes scored by the Afghan people in various fields. As a result of the tireless efforts by the party and the government, he said, the threat of economic stagnation has been eliminated. In this effort we have received effective and disinterested aid from the Soviet Union, he pointed out.

DRA ARMED FORCES CRUSH 'COUNTERREVOLUTIONARIES'

LD212306 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 21 Aug 83

[Correspondent Dmitriy Khavin report from Kabul]

[Text] In the course of a successful operation, subunits of the armed forces of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan crushed the 1,500th counterrevolutionary band operating in Kabul Province. A large arms cache was seized in the liberated subdistrict of Khak-e Jabbar. These weapons were delivered there in secret by way of caravan paths from Pakistan and then sent to the bandits. The dimensions of this arsenal, which was shown to foreign journalists, are amazing. A wide area at the foot of a hill was crammed full of weapons. This is what one of the officers of the DRA Armed Forces told the journalists about these trophies:

[Begin recording of unidentified Afghan with superimposed translation] These are just examples of the weapons we have seized over weeks; the total amount of weapons is considerably greater. For the most part they bear the stamp: Made in United States, Egypt, China and a number of NATO countries. In addition to various firearms, the Dushmans were armed with 82mm recoilless guns, 60mm hand grenades and mortars. Their arsenal also included the most modern weapons: surface-to-air missiles. We also found intricate radio stations of Japanese make. A large quantity of modern compression plastic mines can also be seen here. Such are the type of presents that those who shout out about the defense of Islam in Afghanistan sent to our people. In the course of the operation many documents were also seized, including abstracts of lectures read by foreign instructors on the conduct of subversive activity and use of modern weapons. By increasing their military aid to the counterrevolutionary bands, the imperialist circles and reaction of the region are doing everything they can to expand the scale of the undeclared war they have unleashed against the Afghan people. However, their plans are doomed to failure. The DRA Armed Forces, with the support of the broad masses of the working people, will inflict crushing blows on the enemies of the people. [end recording]

SRV PROPOSES CEASE-FIRE WITH PRC DURING HOLIDAYS

OW210606 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Mandarin to Southeast Asia 1000 GMT 20 Aug 83

[Text] The Vietnamese Foreign Ministry has made a proposal to the Chinese side that all armed actions along the Vietnamese-Chinese border be stopped during the period covering the Vietnamese national day of 2 September and Chinese national day of 1 October.

The purpose of this proposal, said the note sent to the Chinese Foreign Ministry, is to restore the good-neighborly relations between Vietnam and China on the basis of the five principles of peaceful coexistence. If China is agreeable to the proposal for the signing of an agreement to stop armed actions, the agreement will go into effect from 30 August and remain in effect until 8 October. The note pointed out that the proposal made by Vietnam will create a favorable atmosphere for the two sides to settle their abnormal relations. The Vietnamese Government hopes that the Chinese Government will respond positively to the Vietnamese side.

GORBACHEV SPEECH AT CPV CONGRESS PUBLISHED

PM191440 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Aug 83 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Materials of Fifth CPV Congress"]

[Text] A collection entitled "Fifth Congress of the Communist Party of Vietnam" [CPV] has been published. It contains materials and documents from the Congress, which was held 27-31 March 1982: the Central Committee political report to the Fifth CPV Congress (speaker -- Le Duan, general secretary of the CPV Central Committee), the speech of the head of the CPSU delegation M.S. Gorbachev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU central Committee, the Congress' resolutions, and other materials. The collection is published by the Political Literature Publishing House.

IZVESTIYA VIEWS CURRENT ISSUES FACING THAILAND

PM191428 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 6 Aug 83 Morning Edition p 5

[Correspondent Yu. Kovalenko "Letter From Bangkok": "Cares and Hopes"]

[Excerpts] Bangkok -- Thailand has a special place in the Pentagon's Asiatic "schemes." Since the country borders on People's Kampuchea, it has the role of "front-line state" thrust upon it. The visits to Bangkok of J. Vessey, chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and P. Wolfwitz, assistant secretary of state, were significant in this connection.

Alongside the "ever present" questions of increasing military credits and speeding up arms shipments, the question of creating a so-called "reserve pool" of combat equipment in Southeast Asia was also discussed. This means that the Pentagon intends to install dumps of U.S. arms in the region, to be paid for incidentally by the ASEAN countries, in the event of what in Pentagon jargon are called "exceptional circumstances," in other words, for carrying out combat operations. To all intents and purposes, a new stage in the escalation of the U.S. military presence in Southeast Asia is in the making. Several observers have noted that the buildup of American armaments must give Washington a "materiel base" for servicing its interventionist Rapid Deployment Force. Furthermore with the help of such a "base" the United States reckons not only on reinforcing its military positions in the region but also on harnessing the ASEAN countries more closely to the American war machine and nudging this association into becoming a military grouping which would have its cutting edge aimed at the countries of Indochina.

As is well known, concentrated on the Thailand-Kampuchea border are camps of Pol Pot holdouts who from time to time stage bloody attacks against PRK territory. The fact that they are getting their arms and ammunition from outside should, according to the schemes of those behind the anti-Kampuchean and anti-Vietnamese scenario, help to whip up tension in the region and hinder any constructive dialogue between the SRV, PRK and the People's Democratic Republic of Laos on the one hand and the ASEAN countries on the other. Reactionary circles in the country and their foreign inspirers are trying to turn Thailand toward confrontation with the countries of Indochina and prevent the normalization of the situation in conformity with the proposals put forward in particular at the February summit in Vietnam between the leaders of Vietnam, Laos, and Kampuchea.

In Thailand however, there are increasingly loud demands for the normalization of relations with the states of Indochina, a constructive dialogue with them, and the development of trade and economic ties.

In spite of efforts by certain forces to block the development of relations between the USSR and Thailand, eminent political and public figures in the country as well as representatives of business circules have repeatedly expressed the hope that the traditional friendship cooperation existing between the two countries will be further developed to mutual advantage. A real example of such cooperation is the development of trade links. A delegation of Thai businessmen that visited the Soviet Union was led by Somphop Sussangkan, chairman of the Thailand Chamber of Commerce. He talked to me about his country's desire to expand mutually advantageous trade with the Soviet Union. Such trade would, in his words, aid Thailand's economic development and diminish its dependence on the unstable markets of Western states.

Thailand is one of our main trading partners among the ASEAN countries. In the last 3 years commodity turnover between the two countries has grown considerably. In 1982 alone the volume of Soviet exports to the country increased by 10-12 percent.

In April of this year elections were held to the lower house of parliament. They were preceded by a complex domestic political struggle in which the military unsuccessfully attempted to increase their influence on the running of the country. After the elections the alignment of forces in parliament remained unchanged on the whole. Observers note that there have been no essential changes in the country's domestic and foreign policy. In the opinion of many Thai statesmen and public figures the country must follow the path of developing democracy. They are convinced that this is the major prerequisite for the successful solution of the problems facing the Land of the White Elephant.

CSSR NEWSPAPER CITED ON EXPERIENCE OF 1968

LD192315 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1250 GMT 19 Aug 83

[Text] Prague 19 Aug (TASS) -- The organ of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia RUDE PRAVO has published an article under the heading "The Historical Experience of the Czechoslovak People" which says in particular:

Fifteen years have passed from the time of the events which left a deep trace on the development of Czechoslovak society and had no small influence on international relations. We recall the period when the attacks of internal and external reaction on the socialist order in the CSSR, the plans calculated to tear Czechoslovakia away from the socialist community and seriously weaken it, were decisively foiled. The internationalist help, given to the people of the CSSR in August 1968 by the fraternal countries, not only saved socialism in Czechoslovakia but strengthened the positions of socialism and peace in Europe and the whole world, notes the article.

The course of time has given convincing confirmation of the rectitude of the conclusions contained in the document "The Lessons of the Crisis-Ridden Development in the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia and Society Following the 13th Congress of the CPCZ." Today's view of the events of 1968, enriched by the experience of other countries, confirms that international imperialism is continuing to strive by all means to weaken world socialism, alter the relation of forces in the world, crudely interfere in the internal affairs of the socialist countries and fan anticommunism, nationalism and anti-Sovietism.

All those who are honestly and sincerely dedicated to socialist ideas, the article points out, can have no doubt of the necessity of the act of international assistance (?and) solidarity which corresponded to the fundamental interests of both the working people of the CSSR and the socialist community and the international working class. International and external conditions were thereby secured for the peaceful and fruitful labor of the people of the CSSR, and the western borders of the world of socialism were thereby reinforced. The international assistance helped the formation of Marxist-Leninist forces in the CPCZ, and a firm base was created for mobilization of the working people for political struggle against counterrevolutionary anti-socialist and right-wing opportunist forces and for elimination by political means of the counterrevolutionary threat in the CSSR.

A key point in this grave and selfless political struggle, the article underlines, was the plenum of the CPCZ Central Committee in April 1969, at which G. Husak was elected party leader. Only from this time was it possible to launch a successful struggle to lead the CPCZ and society out of the crisis and create conditions for a new upsurge of socialism in the CSSR. Every unprejudiced person must admit that since April 1969 Czechoslovakia has achieved successes such as we and our friends abroad may be justly proud of.

The crisis in the party and society, which at that time overflowed into an open counterrevolutionary threat, did not come out of the blue. It derived, the article comments, not only from the difficulties of resolving new and difficult tasks of socialist construction, but also from serious errors on a subjective nature which were committed, such as inconsistent realization of the Leninist norms of inner-party life, unfounded self-confidence, unrealistic evaluation of the possibilities for further development and attempts to accelerate this artificially.

It was also a serious mistake to underestimate the significance of the ideological and political education work of the CPCZ and to replace it by administrative interference, and to disregard the critical comments, demands, needs and experience of the working people.

The leadership of the CPCZ then was not sufficiently prepared to repulse the massed, well-organized and coordinated attack of the internal and external reactionary forces. It became clear after the January plenum of the CPCZ in 1968 that the leadership of the CPCZ was politically heterogeneous, disunited, indecisive and simply weak, and incapable of repulsing the frontal onslaught of the right-wing opportunists and enemies of socialism of the class ties of proletarian and socialist internationalism which linked and continue to link the CSSR with the USSR and the CPSU and with the other fraternal countries and their communist parties and the world communist and revolutionary movement. The fraternal class ties of the CSSR and the other socialist countries, the article points out, are the keystone of Czechoslovakia's policy. They are and will continue to be a reliable guarantee of the security, independence and sovereignty and the basis of the steady upsurge of the CSSR. No small number of communists and non-party people sincerely devoted to socialism therefore observed the schismatic activities of the right-wing intriguers [politikan] with anxiety and alarm. It was clear to every unbiased person that the results we had achieved in developing the socialist economy, in culture and in all spheres of social life could not be so successful unless we relied upon all-round cooperation with the countries of the socialist community, first and foremost the Soviet Union.

The article stresses:

With the hindsight of years we realize particularly clearly the role played by the new Marxist-Leninist leadership of the party, headed by G. Husak, during the period of overcoming the crisis in the CPCZ and in society. This leadership acted in a principled and creative way, and strengthened the positions of socialism by consistently respecting the interests of the working people and the principles of proletarian socialist internationalism. Only on the basis of this honest and open policy and the restoration of the Leninist style of work was it possible to mobilize the creative force of the people in order to overcome the damage, to consolidate society, to work out and to embark on the gradual implementation of the grandioise program of building a developed socialist society.

Noting that the forces of international imperialism will never stop their struggle against socialist countries, the article says that imperialism, as shown by the development of events in Poland, has drawn conclusions from its "experience" in Hungary and Czechoslovakia. However, whenever counterrevolution has tried to endanger socialist systems it has never attained its final aim. It did not attain its aim in Poland, either.

The notions that our class enemies could destroy the profound transformations brought about in the world by the victory of socialist revolutions are illusory. However, we can see from experience that the aggressive forces of international imperialism, represented in the first place by the military-industrial complex of the United States and its militarist Atlantic allies, are proclaiming quite openly as their final aim the destruction of real socialism.

The article stresses: Never before had the threat of mankind's annihilation been elevated into an ideological and political principle, into the rank of a state policy of imperialism. The depth and the unprecedented scale of danger which threatens mankind is matched by the resistance to this policy by all forces which have joined the struggle for solving the most urgent world task -- averting a nuclear catastrophe.

More and more people are convinced that it is precisely the USSR and its allies who at present constitute the main bulwark of peace on earth; it is precisely they who are the defenders and conductors of the policy of peaceful coexistence of states with different social orders. This is demonstrated by numerous proposals and initiatives, including those put forward in January at the Prague conference of the Political Consultative Committee of Warsaw Treaty member-states and at the June meeting of leading party and state leaders of socialist countries in Moscow.

The clearcut program and the real plans worked out by the CPCZ have become the concern of our entire people. To develop and multiply, by creative labor, the values, and to cherish as the apple of one's eye the gains of socialist and socialist construction.

The article stresses: The further strengthening and deepening of the unity and cohesion of the socialist community are of fundamental importance in their progress toward common aims. We realize the importance of maintaining the highest degree of vigilance with regard to any intrigues by the imperialists and we will not allow anyone to drive a wedge among the socialist states, to undermine the foundations of the socialist system. The fraternal friendship and unity of the socialist countries correspond to the vital interests of their peoples and create a reliable basis for the solution of tasks of further socialist development, RUDE PRAVO says in conclusion.

HONECKER, JARUZELSKI URGE UNITY, ARMS LIMITATION

PM201825 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Aug 83 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Unity of Goals"]

[Text] Warsaw, 18 Aug (TASS) -- The Polish people will continue to reinforce the unity and cohesion of the states of the socialist community, build socialism, and struggle for the peace and security of peoples, W. Jaruzelski, first secretary of the PZPR Central Committee and chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers, declared in a speech at a meeting with the GDR party and state delegation led by E. Honecker, general secretary of the SED Central Committee, which is here on an official friendly visit. Your visit, the atmosphere of the talks which have been held, and their specific results are evidence, he noted, of the unity of the goals of the two Marxist-Leninist parties and of the solidity of the alliance between our socialist states.

Poland's socialist gains are inviolable, and we will defend, strengthen, and multiply them. The enemies of socialism, supported by imperialist centers, attempted to exploit the situation that had arisen in order to implement their counterrevolutionary plans. We did not permit this. Any attempts to undermine the foundations of socialism have no chance of success. The resolution of our internal problems by our own efforts is aided by the trust and internationalist support of the fraternal countries. The aid from the Soviet Union is especially valuable and indispensable.

The achievement of further progress in reinforcing socialism in Poland requires energy and strenuous labor. Poland's active participation in CEMA and the further development and strengthening of socialist economic integration are and will continue to be very important on this path. And we are pleased that integration is becoming increasingly effective in spite of the West's policy of boycott and discrimination with regard to Poland.

In his reply speech E. Honecker emphasized that questions of safeguarding peace, arms limitation, and disarmament occupy a central place in talks between the GDR and Poland. We agree that, in view of the exacerbation of the international situation, it is above all necessary to reinforce the socialist community.

The USSR's important initiatives, along with the Warsaw Pact countries' proposals contained in the Prague Political Declaration, indicate a realistic and constructive road toward a normalization of the international situation. In their joint declaration the participants in the 28 June Moscow meeting of the leading party and state figures of Bulgaria, Hungary, the GDR, Poland, Romania, the USSR and Czechoslovakia convincingly indicated that our socialist community is implementing a consistent line aimed at defending humanity from destruction in a nuclear war and is resolutely defending the people's main vital interests.

The NATO states still shy away from giving a serious reply to our proposals. E. Honecker emphasized that the hopes of the Western champions of the arms race of changing the military and strategic balance in their favor are not destined to be realized.

SHEVARDNADZE RECEIVES BULGARIAN CP SECRETARY

PM191304 Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian 9 Aug 83 p 1

[GRUZINFORM report: "Talk at Georgian Communist Party Central Committee"]

[Text] On 7 August E.A. Shevardnadze, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee, received V. Tsanov, secretary of the BCP Central Committee, and had a talk with him.

Comrade E.A. Shevardnadze told the guest about the development of Georgia's economy and culture during the years of Soviet power, the life of the republic's working people, the constantly developing ties of many centuries between Georgia and Bulgaria, the activity of the republic's Communist Party in implementing the decisions of the 26th CPSU Congress, and subsequent party Central Committee plenums, and preparation for the 200th anniversary of the Geogiyevsk treaty -- the first manifesto of the friendship and fraternity of the Russian and Georgian peoples.

Comrade V. Tsanov cordially thanked Comrade E.A. Shevardnadze for the warm reception and conveyed to him personal greetings from T. Zhivkov, general secretary of the BCP Central Committee and chairman of the Bulgarian State Council. During the talk they touched on topical questions of mutual relations between the fraternal peoples of the USSR and Bulgaria and the constantly strengthening ties between the CPSU and the BCP. D.I. Patiashvili, secretary of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee, took part in the talk, which passed in a warm and cordial atmosphere.

INTRUDER ARRESTED ON UK MOSCOW EMBASSY GROUNDS

OW191612 Hong Kong AFP in English 1528 GMT 19 Aug 83

[Text] Moscow, Aug 19 (AFP) -- An unidentified man today drove a car carrying a home-made bomb onto the grounds of the British Embassy here and was tackled by Soviet guards who followed him in, an embassy source said.

British Ambassador Iain Sutherland later went to the Soviet Foreign Ministry to protest that the guards, who are stationed outside the diplomatic compound, had violated the extraterritoriality of the embassy, a reliable source said.

There was no explosion and no one was hurt in the incident, which the embassy source said was unprecedented.

According to people at the embassy, the intruder, a man about 30 years old, took advantage of a lapse in attention by the guards to enter the grounds.

The guards followed him and jumped on and violently subdued him, eyewitnesses said.

Embassy workers then found the bomb in the Soviet-made car and called in Soviet bomb disposal experts who defused it.

An embassy spokesman said the embassy had not received any threats. He said he did not know what had motivated the intruder.

(In London the Foreign Office said the driver of the car had been arrested after Soviet guards broke the windows of his car.)

(The bomb he was carrying was a "crude kind of fragmentation bomb," the foreign office added, quoting information received from the embassy in Moscow.)

FRANCE TURNING TOWARD POLICY OF 'ATLANTICISM'

PM191407 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Aug 83 First Edition p 4

[Own correspondent I. Shchedrov dispatch: "Near the Danger Line"]

[Excerpt] Paris -- The sharp turn toward Atlanticism and toward NATO, the overt support for America's nuclear arms upgrading plans, and the departure in many areas from France's traditionally independent course established under General de Gaulle, all undertaken by the French Government recently, are causing heated debate at all levels of society.

But official circles are pretending that they have not noticed this. Even after President F. Mitterrand signed the Williamsburg document and External Relations Minister C. Cheysson signed the final communique of the NATO council session in Paris, actions which essentially approve the course toward a nuclear missile arms race adopted by Washington and its North Atlantic bloc allies, official spokesman have been stating that even after this France is not bound by NATO decisions on military-strategic questions but continues to adhere to an independent course.

It is on this basis that Paris stubbornly refuses to count the French nuclear missile potential within the overall balance of nuclear weapons between East and West in Europe. The flimsiness of this position was even repudiated [as published] in a special document produced recently by the U.S. Congressional Research Service. France signed the NATO Charter, under which it must act in conjunction with the other North Atlantic bloc members in the event of armed conflict. That is why, the report stresses, it does not matter whether or not France belongs to the bloc's military organization since the treaty obligation that Paris assumed has the same force for it as for the other NATO countries.

Furthermore, L'EXPRESS, which frequently gives a platform to rabid advocates of Atlanticism, cites other opinions by officials, but opinions expressed privately, with a request not to reveal names. "France has finally freed itself of its phobia about the (Atlantic) alliance," a Defense Ministry adviser stated. "Frenchmen have always felt a sense of unease and embarrassment whenever talk turned to the (North Atlantic) alliance. Now it is no longer a taboo subject," "L'EXPRESS writes, quoting on this occasion the words of an adviser to President F. Mitterrand, no less. And here is a revelation by one of the French Army's supreme military commanders under the previous presidency: "When I familiarized myself with the components of the 1984-88 military program, I said: Hats off! It spoke clearly of the 'Soviet threat.' Before May 1981 no one would have dared do that."

There is some point in recalling the events connected with France's sharp turn toward Atlanticism. The Williamsburg statement included for the first time at meetings of that sort a section touching on problems of joint military policy, a section couched in categorical, clearly NATO-ist tones. "Our countries' security is indivisible," the statement pointed out, "and this question should be approached from a global standpoint." The same stance was reiterated in the final communique of the NATO council session in Paris in June. On both occasions French spokesmen expressed solidarity with Reagan's terminology about the "Soviet threat" and about the alleged imbalance that is occurring between nuclear missile forces in Europe. Immediately after the Williamsburg meeting, many French press organs, particularly LE MONDE, pointed out when commenting on the stance taken by President F. Mitterrand that they [antecedent unclear] harness French policy to NATO's military-strategic plans. The French Communist Party Politburo, in its statement, stressed that this step "restricts France's freedom of action." French Communists have reaffirmed that they resolutely oppose Washington's plans to deploy new nuclear missiles in Europe.

L'HUMANITE, in its commentaries, draws attention to the fact that the "linkage" between Washington's planned nuclear "arms upgrading" and the results of the Geneva talks, as formulated in Williamsburg on R. Reagan's insistence, virtually provides Washington's militarist circles with a "free hand." It is the latter's fault, the newspaper writes, that all the peace-loving initiatives put forward by the Soviet Union have been deliberately sabotaged at those talks.

In conversation, my French interlocutors also quote the explanation that, in making concessions to Washington and supporting its overall military-strategic course, Paris in turn was counting on an easing of U.S. pressure and certain concessions which would help it to resolve its acute economic problems. If such expectations existed, however, they have patently not been crowned with success. Washington has made no concessions on any of the problems raised by the French side. Bank interest rates have not only not fallen but have risen again and the artificial inflation of the value of the dollar is continuing.

The position adopted by Paris at Williamsburg and at the NATO session was preceded by a number of moves taken by the authorities within France itself: namely, anti-Soviet provocations, the expulsion of a group of staffers of Soviet establishments in France, and the whipping up of "spy fever." The government adopted the 1984-88 military program in April this year after long debates. A record military budget which, even among NATO countries, is exceeded in size only by that of the United States is being adopted at a time when all is quiet on France's borders and when there is no sign of a threat from neighbors near or far. One third of the planned budget resources is being allocated for the development of nuclear missiles, including continuation of work to improve the neutron bomb. And this is taking place at a time when France is experiencing an acute economic crisis and when the government is embarking on a rigid austerity program which will primarily affect the position of working people.

French military-industrial circles, taking advantage of the occasion, are increasing their pressure aimed at emphasizing the adjustment in the country's foreign policy course toward a further rapprochement with NATO and at the same time are trying to flex their muscles. A considerable part of the French stand at this summer's air show in Le Bourget was allocated to a display of the latest military hardware. It stood alongside products from the NATO partners' military-industrial complex. That was not the case 2 years ago. At that time on the instructions of President F. Mitterrand, who had only just come to power, the few French weapons that were on display were dismantled and taken away from Le Bourget in army trucks.

Another show -- of French military hardware -- was held at almost the same time in (Santori). Some 160 foreign military representatives were invited to attend by the Ministry of Defense, as LE FIGARO reports. According to the far from complete figures cited by LE NOUVEL OBSERVATEUR, the net profit from arms sales in 1982 was at least Fr25 billion, and this year it will reach a new record.

The supporters of superarming are exerting pressure in different areas. At a recent international "Atlanticists' meeting," some participants campaigned for increased military cooperation with Washington. Support was even heard for the deployment of U.S. Pershings on French soil. Recently in the journal CLUB-89, (M. Oriyyak), main adviser on national defense to the president of the Rally for the Republic, the largest right-wing opposition party, openly called for France to return to NATO's integrated military structure and demanded the creation of an interallied staff and the deployment of the French tactical nuclear arsenal, including the neutron bomb, on FRG territory.

Opposition within the country is growing as the date approaches of Washington's planned deployment of new U.S. medium-range missiles on West European territory in addition to the existing NATO nuclear missile arsenal, including that of France, a step aimed at securing military supremacy for the United States and its allies. It is perfectly obvious that the installation of those missiles would gravely change the situation in Europe, would sharply exacerbate nuclear confrontation, and would increase the risk of war. All this also applies equally to France, whose influential circles are openly supporting the dangerous plans of the United States and NATO, are stepping up the arms race, including the nuclear missile arms race, and are thereby threatening their own country's security, too.

FRENCH COMMUNIST ON ECONOMY, FOREIGN POLICY

LD202315 Moscow in French to Europe 1730 GMT 20 Aug 83

[Text] The French Communist Party [PCF] militants held a meeting in Nanterre to talk about the preparations for La Fete de l'Humanite which will take place on 10 and 11 September.

In a speech at the meeting Gaston Plissonnier, member of the Politburo and secretary of the PCF Central Committee, stressed that this fete will certainly give a new impetus to the struggle of the democratic forces in the country for the realization of progressive transformations. Analyzing the present economic situation in the country, he noted that the problem of employment has become worse again. The program of democratic economic-social reforms applied by the leftist government halted the rising unemployment. Now, as Gaston Plissonnier indicated, it is necessary to take more efficient measures in order to create new jobs. This task can only be achieved provided there is a continuous development in the key economic sectors, and first of all the nationalized industrial branches. Gaston Plissonnier also stressed that the austerity policy of the government which affects the interests of the workers is likely to slow down the rhythm of economic development and to further aggravate the problem of employment.

On international matters Gaston Plissonnier noted the important successes obtained by the forces struggling for the peoples' independence, social progress, and socialism. However, imperialism has not given up on its attempts to re-establish its shattered positions; this is the goal pursued by the aggressive policy of the American Administration. The present situation in the world, noted Gaston Plissonnier, is marked by the aggravation of the crisis that capitalism is undergoing, by the deepening of divergences which are opposing capitalist countries, a witness of which is the monetary and financial policy of the United States of America which goes against the interests of West European countries. Gaston Plissonnier emphasized the importance which is given to the strengthening of cooperation between the countries of the socialist community. Then, on the situation in Chad, he noted that the decision of the French government to dispatch troops to Ndjamena concerns the French Communists because it could have very serious consequences for France. The PCF is firmly opposed to the attempts of the Reagan administration to lead France into the Chadian conflict. According to the French Communists, the problems of Chad must be settled through negotiations with the participation of all parties concerned.

IZVESTIYA URGES DIALOGUE TO END IRAN-IRAQ WAR

PM201809 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Aug 83 Morning Edition p 4

[IZVESTIYA "Press Service" comment: "Senseless War"]

[Text] The third anniversary of the war between Iraq and Iran falls this September.

The continuation of hostilities on the Iraq-Iran front is causing great harm to the peoples of both countries and causing their economic situation to deteriorate. According to recent figures, the war has already taken 100,000 lives. Each of the warring sides is spending $1 billion a month on this senseless carnage. Hostilities in the region are also adversely affecting the interests of neighboring states, particularly the countries of the Persian Gulf zone. To this day an enormous quantity of oil from the damaged Nowfuz oilfields is pouring into the gulf waters. The enormous oil slick is causing the death of denizens of the sea, including rare specimens. Seawater desalination plants have been closed in a number of Arab states.

The war between Iraq and Iran is having a serious effect on the solidarity of the Arab and Muslim countries which oppose U.S.-Israeli plans in the Near East.

The efforts made so far, including those of the United Nations and individual countries, have failed to lead to a settlement. At the same time it is perfectly obvious that the only correct solution of the Iran-Iraq conflict would be the start of peaceful dialogue as a means of eliminating any differences and establishing an atmosphere of stability and cooperation between the countries of the region.

USSR-JORDAN VIEWED ON ANNIVERSARY

LD202246 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2010 GMT 20 Aug 83

[From the "International Diary" program presented by Vitaliy Sobolev]

[Text] Today is the 20th anniversary of the day diplomatic relations were established between the Soviet Union and Jordan. Since then our relations have developed fruitfully in various fields. At present the electrification of rural districts is successfully taking place in Jordan. Electricity will be brought to 300 villages, execution of this task has been greatly helped by Soviet specialists. But most important of course is the proximity of stands on various foreign policy problems. Let me quote some of the things that King Husayn of Jordan has said. The Soviet Union, he said, supports a just and honorable peace in the Near East, it is against the forcible seizure of foreign lands; the USSR gives the Arabs help, strengthening their military power.

It should be noted that Jordan rejects the Camp David agreement, and the United States' attempts to have this country implement the so-called Reagan Near East initiative have proved futile.

IZVESTIYA ON 'ARAFAT MESSAGE TO MOSCOW MEETING

PM191429 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 19 Aug 83 Morning Edition p 5

[Unattributed report: "In Support of the Just Struggle of the Arab People of Palestine"]

[Excerpts] A meeting of representatives of the Soviet public was held in Moscow 16 August in connection with the forthcoming UN international conference on Palestine.

Taking part were representatives of the Union of Soviet Societies for Friendship and Cultural Relations With Foreign Countries, the Soviet Committee for Solidarity With Asian and African Countries, the Committee of Soviet Women, the Union of Societies of the Red Cross and Red Crescent of the USSR, and other USSR organizations. The meeting was attended by the heads and employees of the diplomatic missions of a number of Arab countries and the PLO.

R. ash-Sha'ir, PLO charge d'affaires ad interim in Moscow, read out a telegram of greetings sent by PLO Executive Committee Chairman Yasir 'Arafat. The message notes that Soviet people's great attention to the problem of the Arab people of Palestine is convincing proof of the loyalty of the Soviet Government and CPSU to their international duty with respect to the peoples struggling for freedom and independence.

The telegram assesses highly the activity of the Soviet people, the CPSU, and Yu.V. Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, in the direction of consistent support for all peoples struggling for independence and just peace.

The Palestinian people will continue their struggle for the implementation of their legitimate rights to return, self-determination, and creation of their own independent Palestinian state, the telegram says.

R. ash-Sha'ir expressed thanks to the Soviet people for their unvarying, firm stance on the Palestinian issue and in the struggle to establish just peace in the Near East.

AL-QADHDHAFI VISITS TUNIS, URGES ARAB UNITY

LD192136 Moscow in Arabic to the Arab World 1530 GMT 19 Aug 83

[From the "Window on the Arab World" program presented by Aleksey Zlatorunskiy]

[Text] The official visit to Tunisia by Colonel Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi, leader of the Libyan revolution, has ended. The visit was a new and very important stage in the development of relations between two north African countries which have the same interests in improving relations and widening the many-sided cooperation between them.

Within the framework of Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi's talks with President Habib Bourguiba and Prime Minister Mohamed Mzali, they also discussed international issues of mutual interest. The Tunisian and Libyan news agencies said that Tunisia and Libya expressed their acute concern regarding the existing conflict in Chad, and they hope peace will be restored in that country and that foreign intervention there will stop. They also stressed their insistence on the resolution adopted by the 19th OAU session concerning Chad. Concerning Arab issues, Tunisia and Libya expressed their full support for the just struggle of the Palestinian people under the leadership of the PLO, its sole legitimate representative.

The joint communique directed attentions mainly to the need to reinforce Arab unity, which has now become exposed to continuous provocations, and to the need to draw up a general Arab strategy for the vitally important issues for the Arab world.

Commenting on Colonel Al-Qadhdhafi's visit to Tunisia, observers consider it as an event which will lead to strengthening relations among the countries of the Arab Maghreb and which will make the general atmosphere in the Middle East and the African Continent sound and healthy.

ALGERIAN ISLAMIC COUNCIL DELEGATION IN MOSCOW

LD182106 Moscow TASS in English 1831 GMT 18 Aug 83

[Text] Moscow August 18 TASS -- A delegation of the Supreme Islamic Council of Algeria led by Council member Mohamed Saleh Seddik have today arrived in the Soviet Union at the invitation of the Moslem Board of Central Asia and Kazakhstan. The visitors will familiarize themselves during several days with the life of Moslems and the activities of Moslem boards. They will see Tashkent and Samarkand (Uzbekistan), the Azerbaijan capital of Baku, and Leningrad, the Soviet Union's largest city. This afternoon the delegation did the sights of Moscow.

EGYPTIAN CRITICISM OF CAMP DAVID ACCORDS CITED

LD201049 Moscow in Arabic to the Arab World 1500 GMT 19 Aug 83

[Aleksandr Timoshkin commentary]

[Text] Ladies and gentlemen, good evening. The Cairo papers, not only the opposition papers but sometimes the semiofficial ones, publish reports and comments depicting the growing opposition of the various sections of the Egyptian society to the Camp David policy and criticism of the open door policy.

What is most significant is that the capitulationist policy initiated by As-Sadat is now facing growing opposition not only from Egyptian social and political figures, but also from the working classes of the Egyptian people, on whose shoulders falls the entire onus of this policy.

What really angers the Egyptians most are the attempts to make peace between them and the Zionist enemy the neocolonial imperialist U.S. policy, and the transformation of Egypt into a direct party to the actions of Washington and Tel-Aviv, which are hostile to Arabs. These things detract from the Egyptian peoples' national dignity and pan-Arab respect. It is for this reason that the Egyptian people cannot accept such a state of affairs.

Let me relate the following example: The workers of the Hulwan Iron and Steel Company and the representatives of its trade unions have been refusing to export their plants' products to Israel and unload Israeli goods arriving in Egypt. Thus, the Egyptian workers express their strong protest against the official policy of Cairo, which is directed toward the so-called the normalization of relations with Israel in accordance with the enslaving bilateral peace treaty that was concluded under U.S. auspices. Thus, the Hulwan workers have firmly expressed their rejection of cooperation with the enemy, who is treading upon the national rights of the Lebanese and Palestinian peoples, and indeed all Arabs.

In 1980, the Hulwan workers opposed the visit to their plants by the Israeli prime minister during his official visit to Egypt.

Today, the wrath of millions of Egyptians is particularly evident as they are forced daily to see the Israeli flag fluttering in the skies of Cairo and the Americans in their military uniforms roaming about through the streets of the Egyptian capital and Alexandria.

What honorable Egyptian cannot feel furious to see his land turned into a bridgehead for provocations against the sovereignty of Libya, whose people expelled the U.S. military from their land over 10 years ago, and who is staunchily confronting Washington's neocolonial pressure.

I still recall quite well how the Egyptians welcomed the triumph of the 1 September Revolution in Libya and the liquidation of the U.S. and British military bases there.

Today, the Egyptians see the U.S. military firmly establishing their feet in the Sinai, building bases at Ra's Banas and upper Egypt, and annually staging aggressive maneuvers on Egyptian territory. For this reason, even ordinary Egyptians who do not understand much about politics have been agreeing with the social and political figures who have been declaring in a loud voice that the Camp David policy has tied Egypt firmly to the bandwagon of the neocolonial U.S.-Israeli strategy, which is most vehemently opposed to all Arabs without exception.

It is not by accident that the Egyptian authorities have banned the publication of the book of the great national Egyptian writer, Yusuf Idris. This book criticizes the Camp David and capitulationist policies, and declares that persistence with this antihomeland policy will lead Egypt into becoming a U.S. satellite subservient to U.S.-Israeli influence, and that the Camp David makes the Arabs see Egypt exactly as they see Israel. Such a state of affairs cannot but hurt the national feelings of Egyptians, who until recently, have been in the vanguard of the national liberation struggle of all Arabs.

The growing opposition to the Camp David policy in Egypt forces the protagonists of this policy to resort to maneuvering, as is evident from the calming statements uttered by the Egyptian ministers who claim that Egypt is not an ally of the United States, at a time when these same ministers rush to bow before Washington, affirming the subservient character of Egypt in its relations with the United States.

There is yet another significant fact: Egyptian information media have been trying their best to suppress the news of the "Bright Star-83" maneuvers by the Rapid Deployment Forces. It seems this is being done so as not to arouse the feelings of the national forces, which have been rightly opposing with a loud voice the domination of Egypt by the United States, the principal mentor of Israel.

FRENCH COMMANDER APPOINTED 'TO HELP' IN CHAD

LD192304 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2010 GMT 19 Aug 83

[From the "International Diary" program presented by Aleksandr Levchenko]

[Text] Chad has recently becomeone of the world's trouble-spots. Troop detachments from France continue to arrive in this African country. The total number of French soldiers has already reached 2,500. Originally, REUTER notes, it was planned that they would be subordinate to the present regime of Hissein Habre. Now, however, Paris has decided to appoint its own commander. He is 54-year old Brigadier General Jean Poli. At a press conference the French defense minister stressed that the new commander will receive orders and instructions not from Ndjamena but directly from the chief of the French General Staff. Gen Poli, the telegram says, took part in the wars in Indochina and Algeria. In 1981 he was military adviser to President Mobutu Sese Seko of Zaire. The appointment of a commander for the expeditionary units should be regarded as an expansion of France's participation in the Chad conflict. Whereas at the outset, Paris supplied the Habre regime with weapons and military advisers, and later with its soldiers, the French General Staff has now been officially called in as well to help.

KALIN ATTENDS CONGO ANNIVERSARY FESTIVITIES

Participates in Festivities

PM201426 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Aug 83 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Revolution Anniversary"]

[Text] Brazzaville -- The Congolese people have celebrated in a festive atmosphere the 20th anniversary of their revolution, which initiated profound socioeconomic transformations in the country.

A military parade with the participation of all categories of troops, a working people's demonstration, and performances by gymnasts and artistic collectives have taken place in the republic's capital.

The revolution's historic significance, D. Sassou-Nguesso, chairman of the Congolese Labor Party Central Committee and president of the People's Republic of Congo, said in his address to the nation, lies in the fact that it destroyed the old colonial order and pointed the people's way to liberation.

A Soviet party and state delegationheaded by I.P. Kalin, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee and deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, participated in the festivies.

Departs for Home 17 Aug

PM191448 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Aug 83 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Return Home"]

[Text] Brazzaville, 18 Aug (TASS) -- The visit to the People's Republic of Congo by the Soviet Party and state delegation led by I.P. Kalin, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee and deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, is over.

The delegation took part in the 20th anniversary celebrations of the Congolese revolution. The Soviet delegation was received by Congolese President D. Sassou-Nguesso, chairman of the Central Committee of the Congolese Labor Party (PCT). In the course of the talks a high assessment was made of the state of CPSU-PCT and USSR-Congolese relations. Meetings with other leaders of the republic were also held.

The Soviet party and state delegation left for home yesterday.

UPPER VOLTA COUP 'TO RESTORE TRUE INDEPENDENCE'

LD202224 Moscow in English to Africa 1700 GMT 20 Aug 83

[Unattributed commentary]

[Text] Each government that came to power in Upper Volta earlier promised to take care of public interests, to raise the people's living standard, to reduce economic dependence on foreign investments and to promote the system of education and health service. However, none of these promises were kept. According to news reports, the recent coup is supported by the population. In the capital, Ouagadougou, manifestations in support of the new regime have been held. Captain Sankara, who led the coup, has said the goal of his government is to restore true independence, to defend freedom and to protect the honor and dignity of Upper Volta's citizens. The head of the National Revolution Council accused his predecessors of submitting the country's policy to neocolonialist interests and expressed support for the national liberation movement that fights for eradicating exploitation and for promoting racial equality and equal rights irrespective of skin color. Upper Volta, he stressed, will continue to play an active role in the Nonaligned Movement, maintain fraternal ties with neighbor nations and develop relations with all countries.

The Western media lost no time in unleashing a campaign of slander against Captain Sankara, calling him Libya's pawn. Though the West subjected the new government in Upper Volta to pressure without delay, (?and seeking) to make it pursue the policy of its predecessors. [sentence as heard] Whether or not Upper Volta succeeds in putting an end to its chronic political instability and in starting at long last to resolve its pressing economic and social reforms will depend on the new leaders' ability to withstand the pressure brought to bear on them.

UPCOMING WEINBERGER C. AMERICA TOUR PREVIEWED

'Far From Peaceful'

LD212259 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 21 Aug 83

[Text] The U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger is going to El Salvador, Honduras, and Panama shortly. The visit, U.S. television reports, is to stress the U.S. desire to fulfill the commitments it has undertaken to increase its military presence in the region. Here is the latest comment. At the microphone is Vitaliy Sobolev: The American journalist's flowery sentence signifies that Weinberger's mission is far from peaceful. Let it be on the conscience of Washington propaganda to pretentiously describe the aggressive plans of the United States in Central America as commitments. And so it is evident that the head of the Pentagon is coming to the region together with the U.S. Marines, with the aircraft carriers, with a whole fleet of warships and aircraft, not without reflection. Although official Washington assures its people and the whole world that it is only a matter of military maneuver, it does not conceal the fact that with the so-called commitments it wants to put the fear of God into the Salvadoran patriots and the Government of Nicaragua. The lips of high-ranking officials have also been voicing aloud the desire that the Nicaraguan Government should change its policy -- in what direction, it can be understood.

A question: How far is the United States intending to go for the sake of fulfilling this desire? Here is what THE NEW YORK TIMES writes on this matter: If the revolutionaries of Nicaragua and the Salvadoran guerrillas do not capitulate before this demonstration of American might -- which they almost certainly will not do, the paper notes -- President Reagan will hardly have any choice left between changing his Central American policy and an invasion with guns, aircraft, and personnel.

In this light the visit by the defense secretary to the region of possible combat operations looks fairly sinister. At the same time, Washington's streamlined wording does not deceive anyone, and the degree of alarm of sober-minded people can be gauged even from THE NEW YORK TIMES article. Ronald Reagan, the paper writes, may, if Congress does not stop him, drag our country into the most unnecessary, shameless, unwanted, and endless war in all history, not excepting the Vietnam war. Neither in El Salvador nor in Honduras will Weinberger, of course, hear objections raised by the local rulers to the American plans. But other visitors from the United States to other Latin American countries have had to give ear to quite a few protests, albeit in diplomatic form, against the intervention in Central American affairs. Countries of Latin America, for instance Mexico, Columbia, Venezuela, and Panama, have their own plans of how to settle the conflicts in this region. These plans envisage removal of intervention from outside and talks between the sides concerned. A good basis for accord without damage to anyone's interests or prestige is created by the principles of a statement put forward by Cuba and Nicaragua. These constructive proposals enjoy the full support of the Soviet Union. As was noted by Yuriy Vladimirovich Andropov in his talk with American senators, the interests of the peoples of Central America and the broad interests of international security urgently demand that everything be done to prevent the situation in this region from getting out of control.

Connection with Military Maneuvers

LD202054 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 20 Aug 83

[Text] The American ABC television network has reported that U.S. Defense Secretary Casper Weinberger is to visit a number of Central American countries at the beginning of September. He will visit El Salvador, Honduras and also Panama.

This trip is of course not fortuitously timed to coincide with the current major maneuvers of the U.S. Armed Forces in Central America and off its shores, the international journalist Aleksandr Baryshev notes. These present war games are unprecedented in scale. Their duration -- 6 months -- makes it possible to draw the conclusion that Washington is embarking on a permanent military presence in the region. As THE WASHINGTON POST writes, the maneuvers are conceived so as to keep some of the ships in Central American waters all the time, changing them at definite intervals of time.

It is about this military presence, all things considered, that Weinberger will be holding talks. He will discuss how to coordinate the operations of U.S. troops with the operations of punitive troops in El Salvador who are waging war against their own people, and the training of the Honduran Army for open actions against Nicaragua. The United States wants to make its military presence a permanently operating military-political factor in the region, a factor which will sharply increase tension in Central America. Not long before it became known that the Pentagon chief was going to El Salvador, Honduras and Panama, Undersecretary for Policy Fred Ikle, commenting on the maneuvers which were starting, said: In case of need we are capable of sending bigger forces there.

In the current exercises on dry land a key role is allocated to Honduras. At one stage of the maneuvers in November, on Honduran territory not far from the new military training center at Puerto Castilla, several thousand U.S. Marines will take part in a seaborne landing. This is evident preparation for aggression. Weinberger's coming trip, just like the maneuvers, convincingly prove the Reagan and American politicians are lying when they talk about their desire for peaceful settlement of the conflict in Central America.

RESULTS OF REAGAN'S VISIT TO MEXICO DISCUSSED

PM191146 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Aug 83 First Edition p 5

[Vitality Korionov: "Commentator's Column": "Rejection of Diktat"]

[Text] A meeting has been held between Mexico's President de la Madrid and U.S. President Reagan in the Mexican city of La Paz.

The meeting took place at an anxious time for Central America. U.S. warships are concentrating in the waters around the countries of Central America. U.S. troops are landing in Honduras for maneuvers. The Guatemalan and Salvadoran regimes have reached an agreement of broadening their military cooperation which is spearheaded against Nicaragua. In Guatemala a dictator has been brought to power who is even more obedient to Washington's orders. The White House is issuing new threats against Cuba, Nicaragua, and other countries and peoples who are defending their sovereignty.

A definite political course can be seen in all this: The Washington administration intends to impose its diktat on the Latin American peoples by any means, including military means. It is doing its utmost to block any attempts at reaching a political settlement in the region. In particular, the White House is setting in motion the machinery of measures formulated by the U.S. National Security Council to neutralize Mexico's constructive foreign policy activity and to exert economic and financial pressure on it.

As press reports show, at the La Paz meeting the U.S. President tried to secure the Mexican side's support for his aggressive policy in the region. This attempt did not achieve its aim. The U.S. ruling elite's fabrications to the effect that Central America is threatened by the "intrigues of international communism" are rejected by sensible Latin Americans.

U.S. pressure is countered by Mexico's consistent course toward a peaceful solution of the conflict. Newspapers and news agencies report that de la Madrid stated to the U.S. President that the region's stability is threatened by profound economic crisis and by a demonstration of force, and that the problems that exist there can only be resolved by means of a constructive political discussion. The U.S. President was told that the Central American peoples must determine their fate themselves. The Mexican president appealed for the principles of the self-determination of the peoples and of noninterference in their affairs to be respected.

The meeting between the two presidents, U.S. newspapers conclude, "highlighted rather than removed the differences on Central America's problems."

In La Paz there was a clash between the two approaches to the solution of the acute problems of the Central American region. The meeting confirmed that Washington's "gunboat" and "big stick" policies are meeting with growing opposition. The peace-loving states and peoples are fully resolved to defend their rights in the face of U.S. imperialism's encroachments.

U.S. 'PLANNING' MILITARY COUP IN EL SALVADOR

LD210636 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0104 GMT 21 Aug 83

[Text] The U.S. Administration is planning to carry out a military coup in El Salvador, as result of which a government made up of representatives of rightist forces who are uncompromised [neskomprometirovanniye] in the eyes of public opinion, would be brought to power. The present regime, despite all the aid it receives from Washington, is not in a position to put an end to partisan movements. In the last year of the civil war alone government forces lost over a quarter of their number.

CPSU CENTRAL COMMITTEE POLITBURO CONVENES

Issues Discussed

PM221541 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 20 Aug 83 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "At the CPSU Central Committee Politburo"]

[Text] At its regular meeting the CPSU Central Committee Politburo has endorsed the results of a meeting with veteran party members that was held at the CPSU Central Committee The Politburo holds that the meeting of Yuriy Andropov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee with veteran party members is an important social and political event, convincing evidence of the monolithic unity of the party ranks, of all the generations of the Soviet people in the struggle for the triumph of the communist ideals, loyalty to the CPSU, to the great cause of Lenin. The meeting showed a profound respect of the party for the glorious revolution of the party; the constant care for the preservation and replenishment of the revolutionary, combat, and labor experience; of the Leninist traditions of the party life; for the strengthening of the ties with the masses.

During the meeting it was stressed that the measures for improving the style of management and all aspects of life in our country, for increasing the demands made on cadres, for strengthening discipline and organization, and for the intensification of production worked out and being implemented by the CPSU Central Committee -- all correspond to the interests of all Soviet people and have a beneficial effect on the development of the economy and the raising of the people's well being.

The CPSU Central Committee Politburo highly assessed the unanimous support of veteran party members for the domestic and foreign policy of the CPSU and their contribution to the Soviet people's effort to implement the decisions of the 26th party congress, the November (1982) and June (1983) Plenums of the CPSU Central Committee, and the fruitful activity for communist upbringing of the working people, particularly youth.

The Central Committees of the communist parties of union republics and the party committees ofkrays and oblasts are given the task of ensuring wide propaganda and explanation of the materials of the meeting to party trade unions, Komsomol organizations, labor collectives, and to the population in their respective areas.

It is recommended that local party committees regularly hold meetings with party and labor veterans, representatives of various generations.

The CPSU Central Committee Politburo has made it incumbent upon party, administrative, trade union, komsomol, and economic organs to carefully study questions which are put forward by veterans; to take corresponding measures; to show constant concern for raising the role of veterans in all spheres of production and public activity; and to make use of their great life [ahiznenyy] and political experience in organizational-party and ideological work to educate Soviet people in the spirit of loyalty to Leninist ideals and foster devotion to the socialist homeland and the cause of the Communist Party.

The CPSU Central Committee Politburo approved the conversation of Yuriy Andropov, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, president of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, with William Winpisinger, president of the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers (USA), vice president of the American AFL-CIO trade union association, who is staying in the USSR at the head of a union delegation.

The meeting of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo reviewed measures to speed up the scientific-technical progress in the national economy.

A CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolution to promote the implementation of the measures outlined in the 26th CPSU Congress decisions was adopted -- measures to ensure the further acceleration of scientific and technical progress as the decisive condition of the intensification of the country's economy. Its draft resolution had been discussed in some of the Central Committees of the communist parties of union republics, regional and city party committees, ministries and departments, research, research and production, and production associations, design and technological organizations, and had received support and approval. The discussions of the draft resolution in the collectives were permeated by a sense of concern for the ways for attaining introduction of the achievements of science and technology in the production and on this basis ensuring a substantial increase in labor productivity in the national economy.

The resolution adopted by the meeting sets forth a complex set of measures devised to ensure the manufacture by domestic industry in the coming few years and on the basis of accelerated introduction of advanced production processes of machines, equipment, instruments, and other products which would not be inferior in their efficiency to the best modern models. At the same time it is planned to carry out measures to strengthen and develop the test production and experimental base of enterprises, scientific establishments, research and design and planning organizations; to confirm in the plans of associations and works the production capacity reserves needed for timely preparation for the production of new machinery; and to enhance the role of consumers in the development of up to date products. Measures are envisaged for the further expansion and deepening of inter-industrial specialization and coordination of production, for the improvement of the system of certification or products, for the establishment of additions to wholesale prices for the new and highly efficient products and reductions in price for outdated products for material incentives for those taking a direct part in the development and mastering of new machinery, technology, and materials in production.

One of the main areas of work in speeding up the scientific-technical progress is large-scale automation of production processes on the basis of the use of high-efficiency machine-tools, machines and mechanisms, robot complexes and computers. For this purpose it is necessary to speed up the setting up of flexible automatic manufacturing facilities and automatic designing systems ensuring a reduction of the time and the improvement of the quality of design and development operations. A substantial decrease in the share of manual labor and the raising of the technical level of the products being turned out.

The resolution also formulates a complex of specific measures devised to raise the responsibility of the collectives of the associations, enterprises, ministries, departments and their heads for speeding up the introduction of the achievements of science and technology in the national economy.

The CPSU Central Committee Politburo reviewed a number of other issues.

New Department Chief

LD192124 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1630 GMT 19 Aug 83

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee has approved the appointment of Comrade Medvedev as head of the Department of Science and Academic Institutions in the CPSU Central Committee. Comrade Trapeznikov has been released from his duties as head of this department in connection with his retirement. The CPSU Central Committee Politburo expressed gratitude to Sergey Pavlovich Trapeznikov, member of the CPSU Central Committee, for his conscientious work for the good fo the party and the people.

PARTY LOOKS TO VETERANS, SOVIET YOUTH

PM181311 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 18 Aug 83 First Edition p 1

[Editorial: "To Worthily Serve the Motherland"]

[Excerpt] The party's course is a Leninist course. It received a high evaluation in the speeches of veterans at the meeting at the CPSU Central Committee. This meeting reaffirmed with special force profound conviction in the lasting value of communist ideals and in the correctness of the path which the party is traveling. It showed the realism and the judiciousness of the party approach to evaluating our successes and the problems which still await solution. A creative, innovatory approach without which it is impossible to resolve successfully the tasks posed by life and by the practice of improving developed socialism. Major, large-scale tasks are arising on the way to improving developed socialism. The country has entered a new stage of its economic development -- a stage when the increased potential and increased social requirements dictate the need seriously to enhance the standard of all economic work, substantially improve the economy' efficiency, and turn out entire economy into a continuously operating and well tuned mechanism.

The resolution of these problems and the acceleration of the process of switching the economy onto an intensive path of development are connected with improving the standard of ideological mass political work and strengthening organization, responsibility, and discipline in all links of our social organism. The successful resolution of these tasks demands an increased effort from the entire Soviet people and a weighter contribution by every Soviet person to our common cause. The party pins particularly great hopes on the young generation of builders of communism. This is precisely why great attention was devoted to work with youth at the meeting with veterans at the CPSU Central Committee. New generations are not reproduced like copies on a duplicating machine. Each one, while inevitably relying on the previous generation's experience, evaluates and assimilates the world in its own way, introducing new methods and means into its creative activity, and adapting to the conditions and situation of its own time.

Only by taking these factors into consideration is it possible to work fruitfully and purposefully with youth. It is important to be sure that the older generations are replaced by people who will forgo the October banner in Lenin's ideas in nothing and who know their job well and thoroughly. The rearing of such people is a truly party approach ensuring the continuity of our glorious Leninist party's great cause. Soviet youth, the worthy successor to this great cause, is at the forefront of communist building. Taking over the baton from its elders, it also assumes the full weight of civic responsibility for the motherland's defense capability and the defense of socialist gains. In this connection, it was pointed out at the meeting at the CPSU Central Committee, the military-patriotic education of young people is of lasting significance.

Increasingly politically mature, educated, and trained young people are being drafted into the USSR Armed Forces. Soviet servicemen are piously loyal to our glorious revolutionary, labor, and combat traditions and persistently augment them. They persistently master military skill, serve irreproachably and vigilantly, and struggle to further strengthen organization and discipline and enhance combat readiness. Constant meetings with veterans, whose experience, knowledge, and example inspire Army and Navy youth to new successes in service, training, and military labor, are of tremendous significance in resolving these tasks. To selflessly serve one's socialist homeland, strengthen its might, be a patriot and internationalist, and struggle selflessly for all the good things in which our people believe and for which they strive -- this is what the veterans' example calls for. And Soviet people and Soviet servicemen firmly follow this example and are confidently resolving the tasks of communist building under the Leninist party's leadership.

JAN-JUL INDUSTRIAL PERFORMANCE REVIEWED

CSA Report

PM191041 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 17 Aug 83 p 3

[Unattributed commentary on 7-month industry figures: "There Must Be No Debts"]

[Text] The USSR Central Statistical Administration has summed up the results of industrial work in July and in the first 7 months of the year. By and large they are positive. The monthly plan was exceeded by 1 percent and the 7-month plan by 2 percent. Compared with the same period last year output increased by 3.8 percent which is more than envisaged by the annual plan.

Further progress was made in improving industrial production efficiency. In particular, labor productivity increased by 3.1 percent in the January-July period. Some 84 percent of the increase in output was due to this. Quality improved: More than 78,000 articles received the state seal of quality. They constitute 15.7 percent of total output.

However, in July not all the industrial ministries ensured fulfillment of plan targets. Stragglers included the Ministry of Power Machine Building, the Ministry of Construction, Road, and Municipal Machine Building, the Ministry of the Timber, Pulp, and Paper, and Wood Processing Industry; the USSR Ministry of Ferrous Metallurgy; and the Ministry of the Electrical Equipment Industry. Kirghiz industry failed to cope with the sales plan and enterprises of the USSR Ministry of the Coal Industry did not fulfill targets on improving labor productivity.

The best 7-month results were achieved by the following all-union and union republican ministries (the first column of figures represents overall production growth, the second shows labor productivity growth and the third represents percentage plan fulfillment in January-July):

Main Administration for the Microbiological Industry	117.0	113.1	104
Ministry of Fruit and Vegetable Farming	111.0	107.4	105
Ministry of Machine Building for Animal Husbandry and Fodder Production	110.3	107.0	102
Ministry for the Production of Mineral Fertilizers	109.0	107.0	102
Ministry of Chemical and Petroleum Machine Building	107.9	107.7	102
Ministry of the Medical Industry	107.9	107.2	101
Ministry of the Machine Tool and Tool Building Industry	106.2	105.6	102
Ministry of the Gas Industry	106.1	104.8	102
Ministry of Tractor and Agricultural Machine Building	106.0	105.3	102

In July not all the ministries ensured the set rate of production and labor productivity growth. It slowed down somewhat in some sectors and this affected overall results. A number of very important production program targets were not reached: There was a shortfall in supplies of many types of industrial products to the national economy. In the 7 months since the beginning of the year the sales plan, taking into account deliveries, was underfulfilled by 2 percent and approximately 40 percent of the enterprises failed to cope with it. Worst of all is the delivery fulfillment situation in the Ministry of the Petroleum Refining and Petrochemical Industry. Some 70 percent of this ministry's enterprises which employ this indicator are lagging behind. That is why the sector has the lowest figure for the fulfillment of the sales plan taking into account deliveries -- 77 percent for the 7 months.

Contract discipline is lax at enterprises of the Ministry of Power Machine Building, the Ministry of the Chemical Industry, the Ministry for the Production of Mineral Fertilizers, and especially the Ministry of Heavy and Transport Machine Building in which 82 percent of the enterprises are failing to fulfill this basic assessment indicator. Ferrous metallurgy and light, timber and paper industry collectives are most behind with supplies to workers in related sectors.

The best delivery situation can be found at enterprises for the USSR Ministry of Nonferrous Metallurgy, the Ministry of the Machine Tool and Tool Building Industry, the Ministry of Machine Building for Animal Husbandry and Fodder Production, the Ministry of the Petroleum Industry, and the Ministry of the Gas Industry. These ministries have the smallest proportion of collectives failing to cope with contract obligations and the highest percentage fulfillment of the sales plan taking into account deliveries. The high level of contract discipline has been achieved primarily through the exact implementation of the production program and a persistent struggle to overfulfill targets. For example, in addition to the 7-month plan, the oilmen produced more than one million metric tons of oil and gas condensate and the gas workers produced over 5 billion cubic meters of natural gas. The machine tool builders coped fully with their target, especially on the production of progressive equipment. They manufactured 200 metal-cutting machine tools with numeric program control in excess of the plan and they nearly doubled the production of industrial robots -- customers received more than 1,500 extra automatic manipulators with program control. Some 3,400 passenger cars, 500 tractors, around 300 grain-harvesting combines and animal husbandry and fodder production machinery worth approximately R12 million were manufactured in excess of the 7-month plan. It is important to stress the increased provision of spare parts for trucks and tractors: In the 7-month period the spare parts production plan was exceeded by more than R55 million.

Collectives in the food and meat and dairy industries are working quite well at the moment. Production of meat from state raw material resources increased by 8 percent, as planned. Since the start of the year deliveries have been 226,000 tons more than planned. The target for sausage products was exceeded by 25,000 tons. The trade network received extra supplies of butter, wholemilk products, and cheese.

There was a marked increase in the production of cultural and consumer goods and an improvement in their quality. Goods worth $500 million were produced in excess of the 7-month plan. Some 10,000 television sets of all types, 52,000 radio sets and furniture worth R142 million -- this was the industrial workers' extra contribution to augmenting the marketable stocks of consumer durables. But this contribution could have been much bigger. A number of Ministry of Machine Building for the Light and Food Industry and Household Appliances and Ministry of Light Industry enterprises are behind with deliveries of refrigerators, washing machines, textiles, and leather footwear.

Economic organs and party committees should make a point of monitoring the implementation of all collectives' obligations and take steps to prevent amendment of plan targets. This applies above all to chemical industry enterprises which fulfilled the plan for the production of synthetic resins and plastics by only 95 percent in July and now owe the national economy over 86,000 metric tons of these valuable materials. Serious steps must be taken by the leaders of the Ministry of Power Machine Building and the Ministry of the Electrical Equipment Industry whose enterprises failed to supply their customers with the requisite number of turbines and AC electric motors. Construction sites and other national economic sectors are waiting for 1,500 bulldozers and 1.6 million cubic meters of lumber to be delivered. The paper workers' nondeliveries are causing concern. Although on the whole paper production increase over the 7-month period by 4 percent and more than 40,000 metric tons were produced in excess of the plan, this was achieved through extra production of newsprint. But the shortfall in the production of letterpress paper, notepaper and schoolbook paper is nearly 300 million square meters.

The strengthening of plan and contract discipline is a very important condition of making production smoother in all industrial sectors. Practice demonstrated long ago that effective socialist competition depends a great deal on the quality of business partnership and how workers in allied sectors fulfill their obligations. There must be no debts! -- this is the demand of the day. Any items which are stipulated in economic contracts, orders or schedules which have not yet been delivered must be delivered as soon as possible. Today labor collectives are called upon to focus attention not only on the implementation of current economic plans but also to show special concern for making up shortfalls as a priority task.

PRAVDA Report

PM211540 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Aug 83 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed article: "All-Union Competition Diary: Industry: On the Basis of the End Result"]

[Text] The competition dedicated to the 25th anniversary of the beginning of the movement for a communist attitude to labor is spreading nationwide. The participants in the shock vigil are dedicating their achievements to this portentous date. The 3-year target has been fulfilled by the collective of the Oktyabrugol Association's Kommunist Mine in Donetsk, who increased labor productivity by 10 percent above plan. Some 120,000 metric tons more iron ore than projected has been extracted and processed by the Belgorod Oblast's Stoylensk Mining and Enriching Combine. Hundreds of thousands of rubles' worth of items over and above the plan have been produced by the textile workers of the Kanibadam spinning and weaving factory in the Tadjik SSR. Leading collectives in all sectors of the national economy are providing examples of highly productive labor.

The 7-month plan for the volume of sales of industrial output was 102 percent fulfilled, and all the union republic's and ministries coped with their targets. The increase in production from the beginning of the year in comparison with the same period last year totaled 3.8 percent as opposed to an annual plan figure of 3.2 percent. Labor productivity has risen by 3.1 percent since the beginning of the year. The 7-month plan for this indicator was fulfilled by the associations and enterprises of all ministries except for the USSR Ministry of the Coal Industry. The increase in labor productivity growth accounted for 84 percent of output. [sentence as published] Good results have been achieved by collectives producing mineral fertilizers and in agricultural and chemical machine building, machine tool building, the gas, microbiology, and medical industries, and a number of other sectors.

Since the beginning of the year the country has received above-plan amounts of oil (including gas condensate), gas, coal, pig iron, steel, finished rolled ferrous metals, mineral fertilizers, tires, motor vehicles, grain-harvesting combines, cotton and linen fabrics, and several other types of product.

USSR Central Statistical Directorate figures for July also show that at a number of enterprises the plan fulfillment indicators deteriorated. In terms of total volume of output associations and enterprises the USSR Ministry of Ferrous Metallurgy, Ministry of Power Machine Building, Ministry of the Electrical Equipment Industry, and Ministry of the Timber, Pulp and Paper, and Wood Processing Industry, in particular failed to cope with their tasks for the month. The monthly plan for primary oil refining and the production of metal and pipes, coke, tractors, beet harvesters, cement, and timber materials, was not fulfilled.

A low level of production, weak technological and labor discipline, and unsatisfactory contacts with industrial partners are, as a rule, behind these failures. Economic leaders together with party and trade union organizations here have something to work on here, all the more so as examples of good management exist in every sector.

Special attention must be paid to output quality. A number of brands of color televisions, agricultural machines, cotton fabrics footwear, and crockery give rise to numerous complaints. Many items bearing the state seal of quality do not meet the demands made of items of the highest category. Rejects mean labor, materials, and energy wasted. And on the other hand good quality goods mean a saving of all these resources. This is why those involved in competition should be geared toward achieving the highest end results in their work.

DOCKING OF PROGRESS, SALYUT SPACECRAFT REPORTED

LD191529 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 19 Aug 83

[Text] Here is a TASS announcement: At 1747 Moscow time today the automatic cargo spacecraft Progress-17 was docked with the orbital manned complex Salyut-7/Soyuz-T-9. The mutual search, rendezvous, approach, and docking of the space vehicles were carried out in response to commands from Flight Control Center and by means of onboard automatic equipment. The processes of approach and docking were controlled by the crew of the orbital complex, Cosmonauts Lyakhov and Aleksandrov. The cargo spacecraft has been docked to the service bay of the station. The Progress-17 spacecraft delivered to orbit fuel for the joint engine unit of the station, equipment, apparatus, materials for the holding of scientific research and providing life support for the crew, and also mail. According to reports from the crew and telemetric information the onboard systems of the scientific research complex Salyut-7/Soyuz-T-9/Progress-17 are functioning normally, and Cosmonauts Lyakhov and Aleksandrov are both well.

NATIONWIDE PSYCHOLOGICAL SERVICE PLANNED

LD182205 Moscow TASS in English 2048 GMT 18 Aug 83

[Text] Moscow August 18 TASS -- Soviet scientists have drawn up a plan for a nationwide psychological service of the USSR. Its heart will be a special laboratory which will receive data on the psychological "health" of workers, employees, and students from numerous specialized teams which will work in all the major Soviet cities. Using up-to-date technology, its staff will work out forecasts for changes, for instance, in working conditions in industry and exercise psychologically substantiated control of work collectives.

The need to develop such a psychological service has been discussed at the 6th congress of psychologists which has opened in Moscow today.

The congress is attended by the country's leading scientists, including psychologists, educationalists, sociologists, philosophers, and medical people.

Professor Yuriy Zabrodin, one of the speakers at the congress, has told TASS that much importance is attached to the development of the psychological service in the USSR. Labour productivity has grown considerably where it has already been introduced.

Psychological services are already in existence at a number of industrial plants, at six Moscow schools, and in certain higher educational establishments in Novosibirsk, Kazan, and Leningrad.

A special symposium within the framework of the congress deals with that new problem.

Participants in the congress also pay much attention to age psychology, to the development of new man in socialist society, and to the psychological aspects of efficiency and quality of work. Special sessions are devoted to problems of management of the national economy, criminal psychology, psychology of physical culture and sport, and psychological problems of the way of life.

The congress will end on August 22.